CHAPTER 2—DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVES

To prepare the Coordinated Activity Plan (CAP) for the Jack Morrow Hills (JMH) planning area, comprehensive alternative CAPs were developed to address the resource management objectives identified during the scoping process.

2.1 DEVELOPMENT OF ALTERNATIVES

The alternatives developed for this analysis were formulated to include the full range of management options or actions that could be implemented in the planning area. The previous options and alternatives analyzed for the Green River Resource Management Plan (RMP) and those analyzed for the original draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and the supplemental draft EIS for the JMH CAP were reviewed, taking into account management and resource issues identified by BLM technical staff in the Rock Springs Field Office (RSFO). New information obtained on resources in the planning area since preparation of the supplemental draft EIS, along with public comments and input from cooperating agencies and users of the lands and resources in the JMH CAP planning area, were also considered in the development of alternatives for this final EIS.

After the original draft EIS for the JMH CAP was completed in June 2000, the Solicitor for the Department of the Interior issued an opinion stating that the original draft EIS did not consider a full range of alternatives for management of the JMH CAP planning area. The Solicitor's opinion directed BLM to evaluate alternatives for the CAP, which included a full range of available management options for protection of resources and land management. BLM was directed to evaluate all reasonable alternatives for management of the planning area as needed to comply with the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), specifically 40 CFR 1502.14(a), which is the Council on Environmental Quality's (CEQ) rule for the range of alternatives that must be considered for an EIS to meet the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

In response to the Solicitor's opinion, the Director of BLM determined that a supplemental draft EIS would be prepared to include a range of alternatives required to comply with NEPA and to select a JMH CAP that addresses all planning decisions for the area which were deferred in the Green River RMP. The range of alternatives considered for the JMH CAP includes the full range of possible management options and actions for land uses and resource preservation under BLM's obligation to provide for multiple land use and resource protection as required by the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) and other laws. An example of additional management options and actions considered for analysis in the supplemental draft EIS and this final EIS include withdrawal of areas from consideration for locatable mineral resource development as provided for under FLPMA and the 1872 mining laws.

2.1.1 Alternatives Development Process

BLM complied with NEPA requirements in developing alternatives for this final EIS, including seeking public input and analyzing an adequate range of reasonable alternatives, including a No Action Alternative. In developing alternatives, BLM also took into consideration management options for planning decisions that were deferred in the Green River RMP as well as direction provided by the Record of Decision for the Green River RMP. Where necessary to meet the planning criteria for the JMH CAP, address public comments, and provide a reasonable range of alternatives, the alternatives include management options for the planning area that would modify or amend decisions in the Green River RMP. Finally, all alternatives meet the management objectives for each BLM resource and land management program.

The process used to develop the alternatives began with a review of the Green River RMP (October 1997), the original draft EIS for the JMH CAP (June 2000), the supplemental draft EIS for the JMH CAP, and the existing policies and mandates of BLM. During this review, management objectives and actions from the Green River RMP applicable to the JMH CAP planning area were identified (Appendix 2). Public input received during the 90-day comment period on the original draft EIS and supplemental draft EIS for the JMH CAP, and also during the scoping process, was reviewed to ensure that all issues and concerns would be identified and addressed, as appropriate, in developing the alternatives and their management action options. (For example, either leasing or not leasing federal minerals in sensitive areas could be considered an action option.) The resource and land use programs were consolidated into the following eight basic management categories:

- Land and water resources management
- Heritage resources management
- Travel-access-realty management
- Recreation resources management
- Mineral and alternative energy resources management
- Visual resources management
- Special management area management
- Air resources management.

Each category contained specific subcategories based on the resources in the JMH CAP planning area and the land use programs of BLM. The management categories were used to describe the range of alternatives and their management options and actions.

Development of alternatives began with identifying and analyzing the No Action Alternative, taking into consideration public comments. Other alternatives were then developed. Public review of these preliminary alternatives was conducted to solicit public input into the development of alternatives before development of the Proposed JMH CAP. Among all the alternatives, the Proposed JMH CAP was developed last.

An adequate range of alternatives has now been developed for a comparative analysis. Descriptions of the five alternatives addressed in this final EIS are summarized in Table 2-1.

2.1.2 Management Objectives

Management objectives or goals were defined for each management category and for each resource and land use program BLM must address in the planning process. The management objective for each category also defines the overall goal for each category. The management objectives for the management categories are as follows:

- **Land and Water Resources Management:** The planning area would be managed to maintain or enhance land and water resources using ecological principles and science-based performance criteria.

- **Heritage Resources Management:** The planning area will be managed to expand the opportunities for scientific study and educational and interpretive uses of cultural and paleontological resources, to protect and preserve important cultural and paleontological resources and/or their historic record for future generations, to resolve conflicts between cultural/paleontological resources and other resource uses, and to foster opportunities for Native Americans to use heritage resources.

- **Travel-Access-Realty Management:** The planning area would be managed to manage the public lands to support the goals and objectives of other resource programs, to respond to public demand for land use authorizations, and to acquire administrative and public access where necessary.
- **Recreation Resources Management:** The planning area would be managed to ensure the continued availability of outdoor recreational opportunities sought by the public while providing for other resource values, to meet legal requirements for the health and safety of visitors, and to reduce conflicts between recreation and other types of resource uses.
- **Mineral and Alternative Energy Resources Management:** The planning area would be managed to provide opportunities for mineral extraction and energy development while protecting other resource values.
- **Visual Resources Management:** The planning area would be managed to maintain or improve scenic values and visual quality and to establish priorities for managing the visual resources in conjunction with other resource.
- **Special Management Areas Management:** The planning area would be managed to maintain or enhance the resource values and characteristics for which the area was designated as a special management area.
- **Air Resources Management:** The planning area would be managed to maintain and, where possible, enhance present air quality levels and, within the scope of BLM's authority, minimize emissions that may add to acid rain, cause violations of air quality standards, or reduce visibility.

It is important to note that all management options or actions for each land and resource use directly and/or indirectly relate to each other. Therefore, management options within each section of an alternative may apply or relate to other sections of that alternative (e.g., Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands apply to all resource uses and activities but are not repeated in each resource section in the alternatives). To gain a full appreciation for the management prescriptions affecting any one resource category, the reader should refer to all resource categories for other management prescriptions and guidance that may apply to the resource category in question.

2.1.3 Alternatives and Management Options Considered but Eliminated from Detailed Analysis

The following alternatives and management options were considered as possible methods of resolving the issues but were eliminated from detailed analysis because they were unreasonable or not practical because of technical, legal, or policy factors.

2.1.3.1 National Conservation Area Designation or National Park Designation

Designating the JMH CAP planning area as a National Conservation Area (NCA) or a National Park was suggested during the scoping process as a possible method of resolving some resource conflicts and planning issues. The options were considered but were not analyzed in detail. Designation of an NCA or a National Park is not a land use planning decision. This EIS focuses on the analysis of alternative management scenarios for the public lands and resources within the planning area, as directed in 43 CFR 1610. Designations of an NCA or National Park are congressional designations, which Congress can enact at any time, and are outside the scope of analysis for the JMH CAP.

2.1.3.2 Other Special management Area Designations

Designating other special management areas or designating the entire planning area a single special management area, such as an area of critical environmental concern (ACEC), were considered as possible methods for resolving some of the planning issues. The proposal for making the entire JMH CAP planning area an ACEC was eliminated from further analysis because the entire area did not meet the relevance and importance criteria and special management needs required for ACEC consideration (Appendix 1). However, the portions of the planning area that did meet the relevance and importance criteria were addressed in the alternatives analyzed in detail. The alternatives analyzed in detail include various considerations for designating new ACECs and expanding existing ACECs. Research natural areas (RNAs) are also identified through the same procedures set forth in the guidance provided in BLM Manual 1613.

Designating new special recreation management areas (SRMA) was eliminated from detailed analysis because no new areas were determined to meet the criteria for this designation, where congressionally recognized recreation values exist or where significant public recreation issues or management concerns occur. Two SRMAs exist in the planning area. These are the Greater Sand Dunes and the Oregon, Mormon Pioneer, Pony Express, and California National Historic Trails. No other areas were identified that needed special or more intensive types of management, such as detailed recreation planning or greater managerial investment (e.g., facilities, supervision, etc.). However, the alternatives analyzed in detail include various considerations for managing recreation resources in the JMH CAP planning area. The remainder of the planning area is an Extensive Recreation Management area, as identified in the Green River RMP.

Designating portions of the area as a National Natural Landmark was also suggested as a possible method of resolving some of the planning issues. The options were considered but were not analyzed in detail. Designation of a National Natural Landmark is not a land use planning decision. This EIS focuses on the analysis of alternative management scenarios for the public lands and resources within the planning area, as directed in 43 CFR 1610. Designation of a National Natural Landmark is a U.S. Park Service designation, which the U.S. Park Service can enact at any time and is outside the scope of analysis for the JMH CAP. However, the alternatives analyzed in detail in the EIS include analysis of geologic features such as the Killpecker Sand Dunes, Boars Tusk, Oregon Buttes, Pinnacles, and Steamboat Mountain.

2.1.3.3 Closure to Livestock Grazing

The elimination of livestock grazing from all public lands in the planning area was considered as a possible method for resolving some of the planning issues related to vegetative resources in the Green River RMP EIS and was dropped from detailed analysis in that document. The same reasons for eliminating the “no grazing” option from detailed analysis in the EIS for the Green River RMP also apply to the EIS for the JMH CAP.

Resource conditions on the BLM-administered public lands in the planning area, including range vegetation, watershed, and wildlife habitat, do not warrant prohibition of livestock grazing throughout the planning area. However, reduction or elimination of livestock grazing may be necessary in specific situations where livestock grazing would significantly conflict with the protection and/or management of other resource values or uses. Such determinations would be made during site-specific activity planning and would be based on several factors, including monitoring studies and the ability to meet the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands.

2.1.3.4 Closure to Mineral Leasing

Closing the planning area to new mineral leasing of federal minerals was considered as a possible method to resolve conflicts with other resource uses. Because the federal leasable minerals in much of the planning area have already been leased and portions of the area are developed, this option would not help resolve the issues. The proposal was eliminated from further analysis because resource conflicts tend to be located in specific, scattered areas and are thus not conducive to entire JMH CAP planning area. Closing the entire planning area to new mineral leasing would eliminate mineral development and production activities in areas where conflicts do not exist, thereby placing unreasonable restrictions on such activities.

In addition, based on the Reasonably Foreseeable oil and gas Development Scenario (RFD) and the Hydrocarbon Occurrence and Development (HOD) report for the JMH CAP area, BLM does not anticipate a large amount of new development that would lead to unacceptable levels of adverse effects in all areas. The analysis of impacts indicated that effects were not anticipated on every acre and that not all acres where development would occur were so sensitive as to preclude all new development. Therefore, because the entire planning area does not have conflicts with fluid mineral leasing, closure to new leasing of federal oil and gas resources in the entire planning area is unreasonable.

Because development is likely to be limited in scope and effect, it was concluded that it would not be reasonable to analyze this option in detail. However, not issuing new mineral leases in portions of the planning area in response to other identified resource needs is addressed in the alternatives analyzed in detail. The alternatives analyzed in detail include various considerations for maximizing individual resource values and uses in specific areas where conflicts exist, and for closing these areas to mineral leasing and related development.

2.1.3.5 Maximum Unconstrained and Maximum Constrained Alternatives

Alternatives and general management options that proposed and/or promoted maximum development, production, or use of one resource at the expense of other resources were not analyzed in detail. Likewise, alternatives and general management options that proposed and/or promoted the elimination of development, production, or use of one resource for the purposes of promoting other resource values were not analyzed in detail. Generally, these options do not meet the objectives of BLM's multiple use management mandate and responsibilities (FLPMA Section 202(c) and (e)). In addition, this approach would not meet the direction developed for the planning area, which is described in the Record of Decision for the Green River RMP EIS. However, the alternatives analyzed in detail do include various considerations for maximizing individual resource uses in specific areas where conflicts exist and for eliminating individual resource uses or maximizing resource values in specific areas where conflicts exist.

2.1.3.6 Applying Standard Lease Notice 1 as the Only Mitigation for Surface Disturbing and Disruptive Activities Due to Oil and Gas Exploration and Development Activities

Application of Standard Lease Notice 1 as the only mitigation for surface disturbing activities due to oil and gas exploration and development activities was not analyzed in detail. Lease Notice 1 is an oil and gas term for the standard lease notice that is included in all federal oil and gas leases. The notice provides guidance for use or occupancy and, in some cases, for prohibition of surface disturbing activities in areas with slopes in excess of 25 percent, within 500 feet of water and/or riparian areas, within 500 feet of interstate highways and within 200 feet of other rights-of-way, within ¼ mile of occupied dwellings, or on material sale sites. The notice also provides prohibition of construction with frozen material or during periods when the soil material is saturated or when watershed damage is likely to occur. The mitigation

described in this lease notice applies to all surface disturbing and disruptive activities, whether or not they are related to oil and gas exploration and development activities (i.e., range improvement projects, recreation structures, rights-of-way, etc.). This Lease Notice 1 option was addressed in the draft EIS for the Green River RMP. The analysis in that EIS indicated that potentially significant impacts to resources and uses in the planning area would result if Lease Notice 1 were the only mitigation required, demonstrating that minimal mitigation would not be sufficient to meet resource objectives or BLM's multiple use management mandate and responsibilities. However, applying Lease Notice 1 as the only mitigation for surface disturbance and disruptive activities in portions of the planning area, in response to other identified resource needs, is addressed in the alternatives analyzed in detail.

2.1.3.7 Authorizing Activities with a No Surface Occupancy Requirement (for All Surface Disturbing and Disruptive Activities) on the Entire Planning Area

A no surface occupancy (NSO) requirement to preclude surface use of an area by surface disturbing and disruptive activities would apply to all such disturbance and disruptive activities, not only to those resulting from mineral exploration and development. Applying this requirement to the entire planning area as project mitigation was considered but dropped from detailed analysis.

Much of the planning area is already leased for oil and gas. Exploration and development activities could (and likely will) occur on some of those leased areas. Not all nonleased or undeveloped areas contain the sensitive or significant resources that warrant this most restrictive stipulation. Such a restriction would deny accessibility to the area and would likely prohibit any surface disturbing or disruptive projects related to constructing range improvements, watershed protection improvements, wildlife habitat improvements, recreation developments, roads and other rights-of-way, and other such developments and improvements. This could also impact areas with sensitive resources on adjacent leased areas, as activity would be moved to these adjacent areas. However, applying the NSO requirement as mitigation for surface disturbing and disruptive activities in portions of the planning area, in response to other identified resource needs, is addressed in the alternatives analyzed in detail.

2.1.3.8 Prohibiting Oil and Gas Exploration and Development Activity on Existing Leased Areas

During scoping and the public comment period for the supplemental draft EIS, it was suggested that an alternative be considered that would evaluate impacts of a prohibition of further exploration or development of federal lands and minerals that are already leased for oil and gas. Under this option, activities would continue on private and state lands and minerals, but not on federal lands and minerals. After review of the leases issued for federal minerals, BLM determined that this alternative was not reasonable.

To prohibit any new development on all existing leases in the JMH CAP (and to indefinitely retain temporary suspensions that are in effect in portions of the planning area) is unreasonable because all lands with existing leases are not so sensitive or critical that some level of development cannot occur. In addition, timing of development on existing leases can provide for avoiding unacceptable levels of adverse effects and for balancing a mix of multiple uses in the JMH CAP area. Some development has occurred in this area and is ongoing. The effects of this development as a whole do not cause major conflicts with resources and users to the extent that the existing development should be precluded.

In addition, based on the RFD and HOD for the JMH CAP area, BLM does not anticipate a large amount of new development that would lead to unacceptable levels of adverse effects in all areas with existing leases. The analysis of impacts indicated that effects were not anticipated on every acre, or every lease, and that not all acres where development would occur were so sensitive as to preclude all new

development. Therefore, closure to new leasing or not developing federal oil and gas resources on existing leases within the entire planning area is unreasonable. Closure to new leasing of other federal minerals in the entire planning area is also unreasonable because the entire planning area does not have conflicts with oil and gas or other mineral leasing.

Because mineral development is likely to be limited in scope and effect, it was concluded that it would not be reasonable to analyze this prohibition option in detail. However, restrictions on oil and gas leasing and leasing or development of other mineral resources in portions of the planning area in response to other identified resource needs are addressed in the alternatives analyzed in detail. The alternatives analyzed in detail do include various considerations for maximizing individual resource values and uses in specific areas where conflicts exist and for closing those areas to mineral leasing and related development.

2.1.3.9 Buy Back/Exchange of Existing Producing Mineral Leases

During scoping, it was suggested that an option be considered that would buy back producing federal mineral leases within the planning area or exchange them for federal mineral interests outside the planning area. This option was not analyzed in detail, because the current level of oil and gas production as a whole does not cause major conflicts with other resources or resource uses. In addition, buy back of producing mineral leases would not be cost effective. However, the alternatives analyzed in detail do include consideration of buy back of non-producing leases.

2.1.3.10 Eliminating Surveys for Threatened and Endangered or Sensitive Species Required by the Endangered Species Act, Federal Regulation, and the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands

It was suggested during the scoping process that conducting surveys concerning threatened and endangered as well as sensitive species in relation to proposed actions or activities should be eliminated. The Endangered Species Act (ESA) was passed by Congress to conserve, protect, enhance, and manage endangered species and their habitats. Further, federal regulations require that habitats for threatened and endangered species, and species of special concern or sensitive species will be maintained or enhanced. To meet these requirements, surveys are necessary to determine whether the species of concern and their related habitats occur in the area that may be affected by a proposed action or activity. Because species may move and occupy different areas at different times, survey information does not remain static and will be updated as needed. The option to eliminate the requirement for the surveys was determined to be unreasonable, because it would be against the law, regulation, and policy, and the option was therefore not analyzed in detail.

2.1.3.11 Designation of New Wilderness Study Areas

In April 2003, during the public review and comment period for the supplemental draft EIS, settlement of a lawsuit over the designation of new wilderness study areas (WSAs) on BLM-administered public lands in Utah (State of Utah v. Department of the Interior, 2003) resulted in a change of direction on wilderness designation. The settlement resulted in the issuance of BLM Washington Office Instruction Memorandum No. 2003-195 (Rescission of National Level Policy Guidance on Wilderness Review and Land Use Planning) which rescinded the BLM Wilderness Inventory and Study Procedure Handbook (H-6310-1). Essentially, the settlement established that the authority of BLM to conduct wilderness reviews, including the establishment of new WSAs, expired no later than 1993 with submission of the wilderness suitability recommendations to Congress pursuant to Section 603 of FLPMA; Section 202 of FLPMA does not apply to new WSA proposals; and consideration of new WSA proposals on BLM-administered public lands is no longer valid.

As a result of the settlement direction, the information contained in Appendix 18 of the supplemental draft EIS is no longer valid and will not be repeated in this final EIS document. Also, neither the Pinnacles Geographic Area nor the three new WSA proposals submitted during the supplemental draft EIS public review and comment period were considered for WSA designation in this final EIS. See Appendix 18 of this final EIS for further information on this subject.

2.2 MANAGEMENT ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES

Management actions common to all alternatives, as presented in this chapter, are integral to but are not repeated in the descriptions for each of the alternatives. Specific limitations on managing resources and land use programs guided the development of the alternatives. These limitations are defined in the various laws and regulations that govern BLM management decisions. They are also set forth in the planning criteria to ensure that management actions within all alternatives are compliant with nondiscretionary laws and regulations. Because of these specific limitations, management actions common to all alternatives are discussed below in the management actions' respective categories.

2.2.1 Land and Water Resources Management

Management Objective—The planning area would be managed to maintain or enhance land and water resources using ecological principles and science-based performance criteria.

2.2.1.1 General Management Actions for Land and Water Resources

Healthy Rangelands. The Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands would apply to all resource uses on BLM-administered lands. These standards are the minimal acceptable conditions for addressing the health, productivity, and sustainability of the rangeland. The standards describe healthy rangelands rather than rangeland byproducts. Achievement of a standard is determined through observing, measuring, and monitoring appropriate indicators. An indicator is a component of a system whose characteristics (e.g., presence, absence, quantity, and distribution) can be observed, measured, or monitored based on sound scientific principles. The standards would direct management of public lands and focus the implementation of this activity plan toward the maintenance or attainment of healthy rangelands.

Proper Functioning Condition. Riparian areas would be managed to attain or maintain a minimum standard of proper functioning condition (PFC), which is the minimum acceptable level of ecological condition for riparian areas. The PFC for different types of riparian-wetland systems is fully defined in TR 1737-15, "A User Guide to Assessing Proper Functioning Condition and the Supporting Science for Lotic Areas," and TR 1737-16, "A User Guide to Assessing Proper Functioning Condition and the Supporting Science for Lentic Areas." PFC can be summarized as the minimum acceptable level of ecological status where vegetation, land form, and/or woody debris create a level of inherent resiliency that allows the stream or wetland system to be protected from erosive forces, capture sediment, provide for infiltration, and create appropriate habitat. Riparian areas would be maintained, improved, or restored to enhance forage conditions, provide wildlife habitat, and improve stream and water quality. To achieve PFC, riparian areas would be managed to maintain dominance by species capable of stabilizing soils and stream banks. All riparian areas would be assessed on an as-needed basis to determine existing condition and whether specific management actions would be needed for improvement.

Site-specific activity and implementation plans would be prepared where needed to identify methods to achieve or maintain PFC as a minimum. Plans could include measures to reduce erosion and sediment yield, promote ground cover, and enhance water quality.

Desired Plant Community. Upland and riparian vegetation would be managed to achieve desired plant community (DPC) objectives. A DPC is a plant community that produces the kind, proportion, and amount of vegetation necessary for meeting or exceeding the land use plan requirements. DPC objectives for upland and riparian areas would be established for the planning area through individual site-specific activity and implementation planning, and as updated ecological site inventory data becomes available. These objectives would focus on native plant species and their natural succession. Particular attention would be given to mountain shrub, basin big sagebrush/lemon scurfpea, aspen, and other unique or important vegetation types. Site-specific DPC objectives would be determined by an interdisciplinary team, usually comprised of specialists in soil, vegetation, hydrology, and biology. The team determines desired vegetative conditions for an area by considering ecological potential, current and anticipated resource uses, applicable publications, and professional judgment.

Vegetation Treatments. Herbicide loading sites would be prohibited within 500 feet of water sources, floodplains, riparian areas, and special status plant locations and would be used in accordance with the guidelines in Appendix 8, Standard Operating Procedures for Range Improvements and Vegetation Manipulations.

Watershed Health Assessments. Watershed health assessments would be initiated to determine the condition of the watershed including riparian areas, and would be prioritized based on levels of development, rangeland standards, PFC, and other available data. Watersheds with more sensitive baseline conditions would be the focus for increased monitoring efforts and mitigation (Appendixes 5, 6).

2.2.1.2 Fire Management

Management Objective—The planning area would be managed to use prescribed fire as a management tool to help meet multiple use resource management goals; and to provide cost effective protection from wildfire to life, property, and resource values.

Fire Management Implementation Plan. Fire management in the planning area would be implemented through the Fire Management Implementation Plan for BLM-Administered Public Lands in the State of Wyoming. The plan emphasizes protecting natural resources and property while recognizing the essential role fire plays in restoring and maintaining the health of the public lands. The primary objectives of the plan are to use prescribed fire as a management tool to help meet multiple use resource management goals and to provide cost effective protection from wildfire to life, property, and resource values. The plan would be reviewed and updated as necessary to be consistent with federal wildland fire policy and the National Fire Plan.

2.2.1.3 Water Resources Management

Management Objective—The planning area would be managed to stabilize and conserve soils; increase vegetative production; maintain or improve surface and ground water quality; and to protect, maintain, or improve wetlands, floodplains, and riparian areas.

Water Quality. All surface disturbing activities would be required to adopt design strategies that serve to reduce erosion and maintain or improve water quality. Aquifer recharge areas would be managed to maintain or enhance recharge volume and ground water quality. Vegetative communities would be managed for density and diversity appropriate for the recharge areas. Additional protective management actions for the protection of water quality and recharge areas could include using closed systems for drilling fluids and limiting road density, impermeable surfaces, and surface occupancy.

Activities in aquifer recharge areas could be allowed if a site-specific analysis determines that no unacceptable impacts would occur to 100-year floodplains, wetlands, riparian areas, or water quality, and a plan to mitigate impacts to water quality is approved.

Permanent Facilities. Proposals for linear crossings in 100-year floodplains, wetlands, and riparian areas would be considered on a case-by-case basis.

Erosion Control. When applicable, erosion control plans would be required as part of surface disturbing project proposals.

Colorado River Salinity Control. BLM would continue to participate with federal, state, and local government agencies to develop and implement salinity control plans for the Colorado River Basin, and to maintain existing and future applicable water quality plans.

Wetlands and Floodplains. Wetlands and floodplains would be managed in accordance with Executive Orders 11988 and 11990 and Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

Riparian Management Exclosures. Riparian management exclosures would be closed to livestock grazing.

Fluid Mineral Wells. Water wells constructed to provide water for drilling of fluid mineral wells (oil, gas, or coalbed gas wells) would be constructed in compliance with BLM regulations for resource protection. Hydrogeologic investigations would be required where there was a reasonable expectation that surface water features were in connection with geologic formations being dewatered. Such investigations would serve to determine the potential extent of the effect and provide information that could assist in the mitigation of undesirable effects related to development. Attributes that could trigger a hydrogeologic investigation would include, but would not be limited to, a preexisting designation of an area as a recharge zone; similar water chemistry between surface and ground waters; proximity of a proposed project to shallow water tables, springs and/or seeps, wetlands, streams, or water courses; and/or underlying lithology that suggests surface-ground water communication, such as dipping geologic beds, fractures in the underlying rocks, and shallow producing zones. Mitigation requirements would also be implemented as needed to protect surface waters.

2.2.1.4 Wild Horses Management

Management Objective—The planning area would be managed to protect, maintain, and control viable, healthy herds at appropriate management levels (AML) of wild horses in the Great Divide Basin Herd Management Area (HMA) while retaining their free-roaming nature, provide adequate habitat for free-roaming wild horses through management consistent with principles of multiple use and environmental protection, and to provide opportunity for the public to view wild horses.

Wild Horse Herd Management Area Boundaries and Appropriate Management Levels. Wild horse populations would continue to be managed within the Great Divide Basin Wild Horse HMA at an AML of 415 to 600 horses.

Activity and Monitoring Plans. Site-specific activity planning would be implemented to support herd management decisions throughout the Great Divide Basin HMA. A site-specific activity plan and related monitoring plan would be prepared and implemented for the Great Divide Basin HMA to ensure that objectives for vegetation management are met and that adequate forage is provided to support the AML of 415 to 600 horses. Annual monitoring data would be collected to evaluate progress toward meeting management goals and objectives. Public education and interpretation for the public enjoyment of wild

horse herds in the Great Divide Basin HMA would be provided through interpretive signs and access to sites for viewing horses.

2.2.1.5 Livestock Grazing Management

Management Objective—The planning area would be managed to improve forage production and ecological conditions for the benefit of livestock use while providing for other resource values.

Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management. The Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management (Appendix 10) would apply to all livestock grazing activities on public lands. These standards and guidelines address management practices at the grazing allotment management plan (AMP) and watershed levels and are intended to maintain desirable conditions or improve undesirable rangeland conditions within reasonable timeframes. If livestock grazing were determined to be a factor in not meeting the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands, appropriate management actions would be implemented, as determined through cooperation between BLM, livestock operators, and interested publics. Achieving the standards or making significant progress toward achievement of the standards would be the first priority for all grazing allotments.

Rangeland and Riparian Habitat. Implementation of grazing management systems (AMP) would assist in improving or maintaining the desired range condition. Approved AMPs, or other activity plans intended to serve as the functional equivalent to an AMP, for each of the designated grazing allotments would provide the necessary guidance for achieving grazing management objectives. Appropriate actions for improving degraded rangeland and riparian habitat could include, but would not be limited to, reduction of permitted animal unit months (AUMs), modified turnout dates, livestock water developments, range improvements, modified grazing periods, growing season rest, riparian pastures, exclosures, implementation of forage utilization levels, and livestock conversions.

Forage Utilization Levels. Forage utilization levels for upland and riparian species would be in accordance with individual AMPs, or other activity plans intended to serve as the functional equivalent of an AMP. Determination of forage utilization levels would be based on PFC guidelines, BLM reference handbooks, and professional judgment (Appendix 10).

Livestock Water Developments and Range Improvements. Compatibility with special status plant species would be required.

2.2.1.6 Vegetation Management

Management Objective—The planning area would be managed to maintain or enhance vegetation community health, composition, and diversity to meet watershed, wild horse, wildlife, and livestock grazing resource management objectives and to provide for plant diversity (desired plant communities).

Special Status Plant Species. Special status plants are those species federally listed as threatened or endangered, proposed for listing, or candidates for listing under the ESA. These species also include those designated by each BLM State Director as sensitive, and any species designated by a state agency in a category implying potential endangerment or extinction. The State of Wyoming does not have an official list of designated sensitive, threatened, or endangered plant species. Surveys would be conducted of potential habitat for federally listed, proposed, or candidate threatened and endangered plant species before any surface disturbance. Should any such species be found, all disruptive activities would be halted until species-specific protective measures were developed and implemented. For listed species, protective measures would be developed and implemented with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS).

Fire Suppression. A site-specific analysis would be prepared for all fire management actions around special status plant species sites to determine the appropriate fire management response. Fire equipment and fire suppression techniques, such as vegetation clearing, would be limited to existing roads and trails in special status plant species habitat.

Threatened and Endangered Species. Surveys would be conducted on any potential habitat for listed, proposed, or candidate ESA species before surface disturbance or depletion of water sources. Should a species be located, formal consultation with USFWS would occur. Management prescriptions to provide, maintain, or improve habitat would be developed on a case-by-case basis.

Invasive Species. An invasive species is nonnative with respect to a particular ecosystem, and its introduction is likely to cause harm to the economy, environment, or human health. Federal agencies are directed under Executive Order 13112 to expand and coordinate efforts to prevent the introduction and spread of invasive species. Preventing the introduction and proliferation of invasive species would be accomplished through close monitoring and containment of infestations and through implementation of best management practices for all surface disturbing activities (Appendix 6). Public education regarding invasive species and the means to address them would also be promoted.

Forest and Woodland Health. Management of conifer and aspen communities would be designed to promote forest and woodland health. Old decadent trees may be left standing or downed to provide cover or other habitat for wildlife (Animal Inn). Animal Inn is an education and information program focused on the value of dead, dying, and hollow trees for wildlife and fish habitat.

2.2.1.7 Wildlife Habitat Management

Management Objective—The planning area would be managed to maintain, improve, or enhance the biological diversity of wildlife species while ensuring healthy ecosystems; to restore disturbed or altered habitat, with the objective of attaining desired native plant communities while providing for wildlife needs and soil stability; and, to the extent possible, to provide suitable wildlife habitat and forage to support the Wyoming Game and Fish Department (WGFD) strategic plan population objectives.

Habitat Management Plan. A habitat management plan (HMP) identifies management actions to be implemented to achieve specific objectives related to RMP decisions. An HMP focuses on priority species and their habitats and is generally limited to a specific geographic area. HMPs would guide BLM in managing and rehabilitating wildlife habitat in site-specific locations within the planning area. HMPs could include habitat expansion efforts, threatened and endangered species reintroduction, and population goals and objectives (in coordination with the WGFD and other appropriate federal agencies). To the extent possible, suitable wildlife habitat and forage would be provided to support the WGFD strategic plan objectives. Changes in the WGFD planning objective levels would be considered based on habitat capability, availability, and site-specific analysis.

Water Developments. Wildlife water developments to maintain or improve wildlife habitat and resource conditions would be considered on a case-by-case basis.

Special Status Wildlife Species. Special status wildlife species are those species federally listed as threatened or endangered, proposed for listing, or candidates for listing under the ESA. They also include species designated by each BLM State Director as sensitive, and any species designated by a state agency in a category implying potential endangerment or extinction.

Federal agencies are required to ensure that the actions they authorize, fund, or carry out are not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of species listed as threatened or endangered or that adversely modify

or destroy their critical habitat under the ESA. The ESA requires federal agencies (e.g., BLM) to consult with USFWS to determine whether their actions may affect any listed or proposed species and to document their determinations in a biological assessment (Appendix 3). Land use decisions would be implemented with appropriate conservation measures or with reasonable and prudent alternatives to avoid jeopardizing any species or habitat or to avoid the need to list species or their habitat.

Surveys or searches would be conducted of potential habitat for federally listed, proposed, or candidate threatened and endangered wildlife species before any surface disturbance. Special status species habitat would be protected from habitat degradation, and BLM would take proactive measures to improve habitat on an as-needed basis per BLM 6840 policy and Section 7 of the ESA.

Sensitive Habitat. Crucial winter range or sensitive habitats, birthing areas, the connectivity area (migration corridor), nesting sites, and sensitive fisheries habitats would be maintained or improved. This would be accomplished by maintaining habitat or reducing habitat loss or alteration, improving habitat where possible, and by applying appropriate mitigation requirements (e.g., distance and seasonal limitations and rehabilitation) to all appropriate activities. Exceptions could be provided on a case-by-case basis should exception criteria (Appendix 4) be met. Mitigation requirements would be determined on a case-by-case basis.

Predator Damage Control. BLM would continue to coordinate with the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service–Wildlife Services (APHIS-WS) and review their annual management plan for animal damage control activities on public lands.

All Greater Sage-Grouse Habitats. Avoidance areas for greater sage-grouse habitats may vary depending on natural topographic barriers, terrain, vegetation structure and cover, type of activity, line-of-sight distance, habitat needs, and other factors. Greater sage-grouse habitats would be protected from habitat degradation, and measures would be taken to improve habitat on an as-needed basis in accordance with BLM 6840 policy.

Black-Footed Ferret. The USFWS has established survey protocols for the black-footed ferret (listed as endangered under the ESA). Surveys for black-footed ferrets would be completed according to current USFWS protocol within 1 year prior to conducting any surface disturbing or disruptive activities in all or portions of potential ferret habitat areas (prairie dog colonies 200 acres or greater in size) because of the close association of the two species (Appendix 3). If ferrets or evidence of ferrets were found, the USFWS would be immediately informed, and no projects would begin in the area until the BLM and USFWS determine if and how the project should be conducted. Should a ferret be found in an area after the surveys have been conducted, all disruptive activities would be stopped until protective measures developed with the USFWS could be implemented. Surface disturbing activities could proceed provided survey results indicated no presence of black-footed ferrets. BLM would cooperate with USFWS and WGFD on any black-footed ferret reintroduction within the JMH CAP planning area.

Mountain Plover. Mountain plover surveys would be required prior to authorizing any surface disturbing or disruptive activities in potential plover habitat. Surveys would be conducted within suitable mountain plover habitat by a qualified biologist using protocol determined by the Rock Springs BLM biologist.

Raptor Nesting Sites. Active and historic raptor nesting sites would be protected and managed (e.g., through distance restrictions) for continued nesting activities. Different species of raptors may require different types of protective measures.

Introduction and Reintroduction of Species. BLM would cooperate with WGFD in studies for the introduction and reintroduction of native and nonnative (game) wildlife and fish species.

BLM would cooperate with the USFWS in studies for, and reintroduction of, special status species.

2.2.2 Heritage Resources Management

Management Objective—The planning area would be managed to expand the opportunities for scientific study and educational and interpretive uses of cultural and paleontological resources, to protect and preserve important cultural and paleontological resources and/or their historic record for future generations, to resolve conflicts between cultural/paleontological resources and other resource uses, and to foster opportunities for Native Americans to use heritage resources.

The State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) would be consulted under provisions of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) on any potential effects on heritage resources. Sites that are not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) would be managed on a case-by-case basis according to their values. Sites that are listed or eligible for listing on the NRHP would be managed for their local, regional, and national significance in accordance with the NHPA and the Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA). Sites would be managed to ensure against adverse effects, through proper mitigation if disturbance or destruction was not avoidable. Mitigation may include scientific information retrieval as well as other measures, such as interpretation and improved public appreciation of the heritage resource.

Heritage Resources Protection. Heritage resources in special management areas would remain protected through specific and general management actions (mitigation requirements and site-specific management prescriptions) associated with designated ACECs, WSAs, and National Historic Trails (Appendix 7). Heritage resources are found in the Greater Sand Dunes ACEC (including Boars Tusk and Crookston Ranch), White Mountain Petroglyphs ACEC, South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC (including the Oregon, California, Mormon Pioneer, and Pony Express National Historic Trails), and the Tri-Territory Marker (Map 2). Other areas may be identified and included in the future pursuant to procedures, including public participation, outlined in Appendix 7.

Protection of Scientific Values. Management of heritage resources would include inventories and mitigation as needed for specific projects. An appropriate level of analysis of all surface disturbing activities would be conducted to determine the potential effect of the activity on the resource and its eligibility for listing on the NRHP. Site stewardship and public education aspects of the Heritage Resource Program would continue to be implemented. Sites eligible for inclusion in the NRHP because of their scientific value would be protected. Preservation of the scientific information would be the preferred mitigation method should any such sites have to be impacted by other activities. These sites include Finley, Krmpotich, and Eden-Farson archaeological sites, and the paleosol deposition area. Other sites will be included as they are located, recorded, and evaluated for NRHP eligibility.

The confidential locations of the Finley, Krmpotich, and Eden-Farson archaeological sites would be maintained. Interpretive information would be developed and made available at the RSFO.

National Register Eligible Sites. All National Register-eligible historic sites would be protected through provisions of the NHPA and ARPA.

Native American Sites. Consultation would occur with Native American tribal governments in accordance with the American Indian Religious Freedom Act (AIRFA) for the protection of recognized traditional uses and cultural values in the planning area.

Native American respected places (located generally in the Steamboat Mountain, Steamboat Rim, White Mountain Rim, Essex Mountain, Monument Ridge, and Joe Hay Rim areas) and the Indian Gap Trail would be protected by provisions of the NHPA and AIRFA. Surface disturbance and disruptive activities would be prohibited within a minimum of 100 feet of respected places. Actual distance would be determined on a case-by-case basis.

Paleontological Sites. Documented significant fossil sites would be avoided to protect scientific and educational values. If impacts cannot be avoided, sites would be evaluated and surveyed as needed by a qualified paleontologist. A mitigation plan that may include activity monitoring, fossil documentation, recovery, and storage in a federally approved repository, would be coordinated with BLM before any surface disturbing activity could occur.

Unique Geologic Features. The Boars Tusk area would be closed to surface disturbing activities, mineral material sales, and use of explosives and blasting. The area within a ½-mile radius of Boars Tusk (including Boars Tusk) would be closed to blasting and explosive charges. The Boars Tusk area would be open to consideration of activities such as fencing, interpretive signs, or transportation barriers to ensure protection of the site; however, facilities would be prohibited from being developed on the geologic feature. The Boars Tusk area would be a right-of-way avoidance area. The Boars Tusk and approximately 1,400 acres of BLM-administered public lands in the surrounding area would be closed to any surface mining activity but open to consideration of subsurface mining methods. Activities or ancillary facilities related to subsurface mining would be prohibited.

Tri-Territory Marker. The Tri-Territory Marker is a right-of-way exclusion area and is closed to surface disturbing activities. The Tri-Territory Marker would be withdrawn from mineral location and closed to coal and sodium exploration. The Tri-Territory Marker would be open for consideration of activities such as fencing, interpretive signs, or barriers to ensure protection of the area.

2.2.3 Travel, Access, and Realty Management

Management Objective—The public lands in the planning area would be managed to support the goals and objectives of other resource programs, to respond to public demand for land use authorizations, and to acquire administrative and public access where necessary.

Rights-of-Way. The planning area, with the exception of defined exclusion and avoidance areas, would be open to considering grants of rights-of-way.

Off-Highway Vehicle Management. Management of off-highway vehicle (OHV) activities would be in accordance with Executive Order 11644, as amended by Executive Order 11989, and applicable regulations (43 CFR 8340) which address OHV use on public lands. Designation and authorization of OHV use would be designed to protect resource values, promote safety of users, and minimize conflict among various uses of public lands. OHV designations include Open, Limited, and Closed (see Glossary for definitions). Until specific designations could be put in place, areas of designated roads and trails would be managed the same as areas limited to existing roads and trails.

Specific roads and trails may be closed to OHV use for public health and safety reasons, for restoration or remediation actions, or for other valid reasons.

Exceptions to closed or limited OHV designations may be granted by the Authorized Officer in consideration of such factors as scientific purposes and emergency access needs.

Over-the-Snow Vehicles. Travel by over-the-snow vehicles would generally be subject to the OHV designations, just as are all other motorized vehicles. Proposals for over-the-snow vehicle travel contrary to these provisions would be considered on a case-by-case basis.

Land Withdrawals and Exchanges. Public lands would be retained in federal ownership unless it was determined to be in the best public interest to dispose of some of them.

Land withdrawals and exchanges identified in the Green River RMP would be pursued. Exchanges would conform to the JMH planning objectives and actions. BLM acquisition of lands would be considered to facilitate various resource management objectives. The preferred method for acquisition would be through exchange. Land exchanges are considered to be discretionary and voluntary real estate transactions between the willing parties involved. Exchanges for state lands in WSAs and other special management areas would be considered to ensure easier and consistent management in these areas. Exchanges would be considered to acquire state or private lands that hold high cultural and historical value and that have important resource values, such as habitat for threatened and endangered species. Exchanges to acquire state of private lands would also be considered for facilitating resource management objectives, such as preventing habitat fragmentation.

Ownership Adjustments. Aquatic, wetland, and riparian habitat would not be suitable for disposal unless opportunities exist for land exchanges of equal or greater value (including monetary and functional resource values).

Access. Access would be guaranteed across public lands to landlocked private and state lands consistent with FLPMA.

2.2.4 Recreation Resources Management

Management Objective—The planning area would be managed to ensure the continued availability of outdoor recreational opportunities sought by the public while providing for other resource values; meet legal requirements for the health and safety of visitors; and to reduce conflicts between recreation and other types of resource uses.

Management of recreation resources would comply with applicable regulations (43 CFR 8300 [recreation permit administration]) for functions and activities such as OHV, visitor services, special recreation use permits, and commercial operations. All management actions and recreation uses would focus on the health and safety of the user and would provide for recreational opportunities while protecting sensitive resources.

Backcountry Byways. Recreation project plans would be developed for existing backcountry byways.

Recreation Project Plans. Recreation project plans and interpretive prospectuses would be developed as necessary to provide for recreational opportunities in the following areas: Crookston Ranch historic site, Boars Tusk, Oregon Buttes, Honeycomb Buttes, Steamboat Mountain, National Historic Trails, and White Mountain Petroglyphs.

Camping. Areas would be closed to camping throughout the JMH CAP planning area if resource damage occurred.

Special Recreation Use Permits. Special recreation use permits would be considered on a case-by-case basis. A Plan of Operation would be required for all commercial recreational operators and outfitters.

Appropriate mitigation would be included in special recreation permits, commercial recreation uses, and major competitive events to provide resource protection and public safety.

2.2.5 Minerals and Alternative Energy Resources Management

Management Objective—The planning area would be managed to maintain or enhance opportunities for mineral exploration and development while providing for other resource values.

All minerals and energy resource management actions would recognize valid existing rights and ensure compliance with existing legal and regulatory requirements. This scope would include leases issued under the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 and Amendments, and mining claims filed under the Mining Act of 1872.

2.2.5.1 Leasable Fluid Minerals Management

Areas that cannot be offered for lease include WSAs and other areas where fluid mineral leasing and development would not be in compliance with laws or with land use planning decisions that prohibit fluid mineral leasing and development in certain areas.

For fluid mineral leases, valid existing rights would be recognized. Lease stipulations would be applied as necessary (Table 2-2). These stipulations would notify the leaseholder that development activities may be limited, prohibited, or implemented with mitigation measures to protect specific resources. The stipulations would condition the leaseholder's development activities and provide BLM the authority to require other mitigation or to deny some proposed exploration and development methods. The general types of resource protections in lease stipulations include—

- Controlled surface use (CSU) through limitation on the amount and type of surface disturbance
- CSU through avoidance of other resources
- Timing restrictions on development activity
- No surface occupancy (NSO).

A site-specific analysis would be performed before any exploration and development activity to identify and locate resource elements in the lease area that would require protection or mitigation measures (Appendix 14).

Exceptions to lease stipulations and mitigation measures, identified as Conditions of Approval (COAs) attached to an Application for Permit to Drill (APD), could be requested and would be considered on a case-by-case basis (Appendixes 4, 5).

2.2.5.2 Leasable Solid Minerals Management

Exploration. Exploration activities could be conducted on lands that are open to exploration for solid leasable minerals. A site-specific analysis would be performed before any exploration activity to identify and locate resource elements that would require protection or mitigation measures.

Leasing. Leasing of solid minerals would comply with the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, the Federal Coal Leasing Amendments Act of 1976, and coal regulations and coal planning requirements.

WSAs within the coal development potential area (Map 56) would remain closed to leasing.

2.2.5.3 Locatable Minerals Management

Locatable Mineral Withdrawals. The mineral classification withdrawals for coal and oil shale classifications would be revoked. In some areas these classification withdrawals would remain in effect until replaced with an appropriate withdrawal for other appropriate purposes.

In areas open to mineral location, mining claims could be filed which would allow the claim to be held and developed in accordance with applicable regulations (39 CFR 3809). Mining activities would also comply with other regulatory requirements, including limitations on air and water discharges, waste management, spill prevention, and endangered species.

Surface disturbing exploration activities of 5 acres or less on mining claims would require a notice to BLM. A plan of operations would be required for exploration-related surface disturbances greater than 5 acres, for all surface disturbances greater than casual use, and for a disturbance of any size in ACECs, WSAs, areas closed to OHV use, and any lands or waters known to contain federally proposed or listed threatened or endangered species or their proposed or designated critical habitat. A plan of operations would specify how the operator intends to manage the mining operation and location of surface disturbing activities.

2.2.5.4 Salable Minerals Management

Mineral Material Sales. Existing contracts for sales of mineral materials, such as sand and gravel, would be recognized. Mining of mineral materials would comply with applicable regulatory requirements (43 CFR 3600) and air and water quality protection regulations. A site-specific analysis would be performed before any exploration or extraction activity to identify and locate resource elements that would require protection or mitigation measures. Mineral material sales that posed potential impacts on identified cultural and historic resources, as well as other sensitive resources, would not be allowed. Mining and reclamation plans would be prepared for use areas to provide protection for sensitive resources and to restore disturbed areas.

2.2.6 Visual Resources Management

Management Objective—The planning area would be managed to maintain or improve scenic values and visual quality and to establish priorities for managing the visual resources in conjunction with other resource values.

The four Visual Resource Management (VRM) classes (I, II, III, IV) set standards for planning, designing, and evaluating projects by identifying various permissible levels of landscape alteration while protecting overall regional scenic quality. The scenic quality of an area is a measure of its visual appeal. The VRM class objectives range from very limited management activity (Class I) to activity allowing major landscape modifications (Class IV). Visual resource classes would be retained or modified to enhance other resource objectives, such as heritage resources, recreation uses, wild horse viewing, and special management areas. Projects would be designed to meet the objectives of established visual classifications, and appropriate mitigation would be applied.

VRM Class I Areas. WSAs would be managed as VRM Class I areas to preserve the natural setting and existing character of the landscape. Oregon Buttes ACEC and the western portion of the Greater Sand Dunes ACEC, which fall within WSAs, would also be managed as VRM Class I areas.

2.2.7 Management of Special Management Areas and Other Management Areas

Management Objective—The planning area would be managed to maintain or enhance the resource values and characteristics for which the area was designated as a special management area.

Special management areas are those areas that require special management considerations to ensure that public land and resources are protected from irreparable damage. These areas include WSAs, ACECs, Special Recreation Management Areas (SRMA), and other special management areas, such as watersheds. Management of these areas would comply with applicable regulations (43 CFR 1610, 6300, 8350) for activities that could occur within them. All management actions and recreation and resource uses would focus on the protection of sensitive resources and the health and safety of the user.

2.2.7.1 Special Management Areas

2.2.7.1.1 Wilderness Study Areas

OHV Use. These areas would be closed to OHV use.

Leasable Fluid Minerals. These areas would be non-discretionary closure areas for fluid minerals leasing.

Leasable Solid Minerals. These areas would be closed to leasable solid minerals exploration and leasing.

Salable Minerals. These areas would be closed to mineral material sales.

VRM. These areas would be managed as VRM Class I areas to preserve the natural setting and existing character of the landscape.

2.2.7.1.2 Oregon Buttes ACEC

OHV Use. The ACEC would be closed to OHV use.

Leasable Fluid Minerals. The ACEC would be closed to consideration of fluid minerals leasing.

Leasable Solid Minerals. The ACEC would be closed to leasable solid minerals exploration and leasing.

Salable Minerals. The ACEC would be closed to mineral material sales.

VRM. The ACEC would be managed as a VRM Class I area.

2.2.7.1.3 South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC

Salable Minerals. The South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC (visible portion) would be closed to mineral material sales.

2.2.7.1.4 White Mountain Petroglyphs ACEC

Rights-Of-Way. The ACEC would be managed as a right-of-way exclusion area.

OHV Use. The ACEC would be closed to OHV use outside of identified access and parking areas.

Salable Minerals. The ACEC would be closed to mineral material sales.

Locatable Minerals. Withdrawals from mineral location would be pursued in the ACEC.

2.2.7.1.5 Greater Sand Dunes ACEC

Salable Minerals. The ACEC would be closed to mineral material sales.

2.2.7.1.6 Special Status Plants ACEC

Disruptive Activities. Potential habitat of special status plant species' communities on federal land or on split estate lands would require searches for the plant species before approving any project or activity. Should species be found, all disruptive activities would be halted until species-specific, protective measures were developed and implemented. For listed species, protective measures would be developed and implemented in coordination with the USFWS.

Locatable Minerals. Withdrawals from mineral location would be pursued where special status plants occur.

Rangeland Management. Herbicide loading sites would be prohibited within 500 feet of special status plant locations and would be utilized in accordance with the guidelines in Appendix 8, Standard Operating Procedures for Range Improvements and Vegetation Manipulations.

Fire Management. Fire suppression vehicular activities would be limited to existing roads and trails in special status plant species habitat.

A site-specific analysis would be prepared for all fire management activities around special status plant species sites to determine the appropriate fire management response.

2.2.8 Air Resources Management

FLPMA states that, "The public lands [are to] be managed in a manner that will protect the quality of scientific, scenic, historical, ecological, environmental, air and atmospheric, water resource, and archaeological values." NEPA indicates that any proposed federal action should comply with other existing environmental laws, regulations, and standards (Section 104 [42 United States Code (U.S.C.) 4334]). This would include the Clean Air Act. In particular, the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 indicate that federal actions should comply with state and local as well as federal laws, regulations, and standards. Management actions for air resources management in the planning area would be implemented consistent with the land use decisions of the Green River RMP (Appendix 2).

The management actions common to all alternatives presented above are integral to each of the alternatives described below. However, these actions are not repeated in the following section describing the alternatives, other than for the Proposed JMH CAP.

2.3 NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

The No Action Alternative is defined as a continuation of the present course of management until that management is changed. Ongoing programs initiated under existing legislation, regulations, and the Green River RMP, would continue, even as new plans are developed or new planning efforts are being conducted within the RMP area. Thus, the No Action Alternative describes the current resource and land use management direction in the JMH CAP planning area, represented by the decisions stated in the

Green River RMP, dated October 1997. The No Action Alternative and its analysis is the baseline to which the other alternatives and their analyses are compared.

The public provided comments and information concerning formulation of the No Action Alternative during the scoping period for the supplemental draft EIS (December 6, 2001 to January 11, 2002). Information open houses were held, and a scoping notice was mailed to interested parties and posted on the BLM website. Formal scoping meetings were also held. (See Chapter 5 for more details on the public involvement process.) Comments provided during scoping recommended that the No Action Alternative be the continuation of management objectives and actions stated in the Green River RMP and that valid existing rights should be recognized. In addition, comments recommended that some activity would be reasonably foreseeable and could occur in areas with existing mineral leases (Appendix 13). The cooperating agencies provided similar comments, particularly in regard to the No Action Alternative depicting the Green River RMP decisions.

The No Action Alternative was developed based on these comments. It includes continuation of existing management as stated in the Green River RMP and considers actions that would be reasonably foreseeable based on existing management. Such reasonably foreseeable actions include the lifting of temporary lease suspensions, consideration of vegetation treatments, and location and installation of directional signs for backcountry byways.

2.3.1 Management Actions Common to All Resource or Land Use Programs

Monitoring Plan. An interdisciplinary monitoring plan would be developed to evaluate the overall effectiveness of implementing the management decisions for the planning area. Site-specific monitoring plans would be developed for project proposals.

2.3.2 Land and Water Resources Management

2.3.2.1 General Management Actions for Land and Water Resources

Management actions for land and water resources management in the planning area would be implemented consistent with the land use decisions of the Green River RMP (Appendix 2).

Healthy Rangelands. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2)

Proper Functioning Condition. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Desired Plant Community. In addition to Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2), desired plant objectives would focus on native plant communities.

Vegetation Treatments. Vegetative treatments would be designed on a case-by-case basis. Such activities may include plowing and seeding, reseeding (e.g., wildfire rehabilitation), fence construction, weed control, and enhancement of fish and wildlife habitat. Vegetation treatments would be used to abate, alter, or transform vegetation communities in an effort to achieve DPC objectives, protect water quality, dissipate or reduce erosion, and conform to requirements to protect special status plant species and associated habitats (Appendix 6). This may include activities such as manual or mechanical manipulation, chemical treatments, and prescribed burns (Appendix 8). Prescribed burns would be the preferred method of vegetation manipulation to convert stands of brush to grasslands and to promote regeneration of aspen stands and/or shrub species. The prescribed burns would generally be conducted in

areas having greater than 35 percent sagebrush composition, 20 percent desirable grass composition, and greater than 10 inches of precipitation.

Low-intensity burns during periods of high soil moisture would be the preferred method and timing of prescribed burns in mountain shrub communities. Prescribed burns would be restricted in areas with coal or other fossil fuel outcrops. All vegetation treatments should be designed to be irregular in shape for edge effect, cover, and visual aesthetics. Areas treated with prescribed burns would be rested a minimum of two full growing seasons after treatment and would be fenced from livestock and big game animals if necessary.

Fences. Where documented wildlife conflicts with fencing on public lands occur, fences would be modified, reconstructed, or, if necessary, removed. Herding control of livestock would be encouraged as an alternative to fencing. Fence construction would be in accordance with BLM design standards and located so as not to overly impede wildlife or wild horse movement.

Watershed Health Assessments. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Native Vegetation. Native vegetation would be managed to allow natural plant succession to continue, with emphasis on mountain shrub, basin big sagebrush/lemon scurfpea, aspen, and other unique or important vegetation types.

2.3.2.2 Fire Management

Fire Management Implementation Plan. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Wildland and Prescribed Fire: Wildland and prescribed fires would be managed in all vegetation types to maintain or improve biological diversity and the overall health of the public lands.

Fire Suppression. Full fire suppression would be applied in basin big sagebrush/lemon scurfpea vegetation associations. See also Vegetation Treatments (Section 2.3.2.1).

2.3.2.3 Water Resources Management

Water Quality. In addition to Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2), the area within 500 feet of wetlands, riparian areas, and 100-year floodplains and within 100 feet of the edge of the inner gorge of intermittent and large ephemeral drainages would be avoidance areas for surface disturbing activities.

Permanent Facilities. The 100-year floodplains, wetlands, and riparian areas would be closed to new permanent facilities (e.g., storage tanks, structure pits). Proposals for linear crossings in these areas would be considered on a case-by-case basis.

Erosion Control. Areas with highly erodible soils would also be avoidance areas for all surface disturbing activities. Surface disturbing activities could be permitted within avoidance areas provided that a mitigation plan is approved and a site-specific analysis determines that unacceptable impact levels would not occur as a result of the activity. When applicable, erosion control plans would be required as part of surface disturbing project proposals.

Colorado River Salinity Control. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Wetlands and Floodplains. In addition to Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2), projects to improve the ecological integrity of the dunal ponds would be considered and evaluated.

Riparian Management Exclosures. Riparian exclosures would be developed and maintained, and exclosure plans would be implemented. Riparian exclosures would be used to protect degraded riparian areas from further impacts and to ensure reclamation of vegetation communities and ecological processes. Exclosures would remain closed to livestock grazing, and AUMs in these exclosures would not be available for livestock use.

Fluid Mineral Wells. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Aquifer Recharge Areas. Aquifer recharge areas would be managed to maintain or enhance recharge volume and groundwater quality by limiting road density, surface disturbance, and surface occupancy to maintain a healthy recharge area.

2.3.2.4 Wild Horses Management

Wild Horse Herd Management Area Boundaries and Appropriate Management Levels. Wild horse populations would be managed within the Great Divide Basin HMA at an AML of 415 to 600 horses. The Great Divide Basin HMA boundaries would remain unchanged.

Activity and Monitoring Plans. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Water Developments. Water developments would be considered to maintain or improve resource conditions and/or enhance wild horse herd distribution and manage forage utilization. Such developments within sensitive wildlife habitats would be permitted provided they conform to wildlife objectives. Compatibility with special status plant species would be required.

Gathering Plan. A selective gathering plan to remove excess horses from inside and outside the HMA would also be developed and implemented. Gathering cycles would vary by gathering plan objectives, resource conditions, and needs. Fertility control would be initiated only if necessary.

Public Education. Opportunity for public education and enjoyment of wild horses would be provided by placing interpretive signs, providing interpretive sites, and providing access to the herd areas.

2.3.2.5 Livestock Grazing Management

Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Rangeland and Riparian Habitat. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Forage Utilization Levels. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Livestock Water Developments and Range Improvements. Livestock water developments and range improvements would be considered to maintain or improve resource conditions and/or enhance livestock distribution. Compatibility with special status plant species would be required.

Salt or Mineral Supplements. Salt or mineral supplements would be prohibited within 500 feet of riparian habitat and National Historic and Scenic Trails unless analysis shows that the resources (watershed, riparian, recreation, wildlife) would not be adversely affected by livestock concentrations within these areas. Supplements would also be prohibited on areas inhabited by special status plant species, regardless of analysis findings.

2.3.2.6 Vegetation Management

Special Status Plant Species. In addition to Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2), specific management actions related to known locations of special status plant species habitat include closing locations to surface disturbing activities or any disruptive activity that could adversely affect the special status plants or their habitat, as well as closing locations to the location of new mining claims, mineral material sales, OHV use (including those vehicles used for geophysical exploration activities), surveying, and the use of explosives and blasting.

Potential habitat areas for special status species would be avoidance areas for surface disturbing activities (Map 7).

Known locations of special status plant species would be open to consideration for mineral leasing with NSO requirements.

Rights-of-Way Limitations. Areas where Wyoming BLM sensitive plant species are known to exist and/or have potential habitat would be right-of-way avoidance areas (Map 8). Exceptions could be granted by the Authorized Officer if analysis shows that there is no adverse impact to the plant populations.

Fire Suppression. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Threatened and Endangered Plant Species. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Invasive Species. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Forest and Woodland Health. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

2.3.2.7 Wildlife Habitat Management

Habitat Management Plan. In addition to Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2), habitat management plans would be developed as needed for sensitive and/or highly developed and disturbed areas to mitigate wildlife habitat losses. Habitat management plans would include habitat expansion efforts, threatened and endangered species reintroduction, and population goals and objectives.

Water Developments. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Special Status Wildlife Species. In addition to Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2), should a special status wildlife species be found, all disruptive activities would be halted until species-specific protective measures could be implemented.

Sensitive Habitat. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Predator Damage Control. In addition to Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2), proposed animal damage control activities not compatible with BLM planning and management prescriptions or objectives for other resource activities and users would be identified on a case-by-case basis. APHIS-WS would be requested to amend or adjust the plan accordingly. APHIS-WS would determine the appropriate animal damage control methods in coordination with BLM.

Greater Sage-Grouse Leks, Nesting and Early Brood-rearing Habitat. Surface occupancy (long-term or permanent aboveground facilities) would be controlled within ¼ mile of greater sage-grouse leks (Map 7). Disruptive activities would avoid occupied greater sage-grouse leks from 8:00 p.m. to 8:00 a.m. daily. Disruptive activities would avoid occupied greater sage-grouse leks from usually February 1 to June 30. The actual area to be avoided, usually within ¼ to ½ mile of the lek, and appropriate seasonal limitations would be determined on a case-by-case basis. Seasonal limitations on disturbing and disruptive activities (usually from February 1 to July 31) would apply up to 2 miles from greater sage-grouse leks (nesting and early brood-rearing habitat) on a case-by-case basis (Map 7). Nesting and early brood-rearing habitats would be protected from habitat degradation, and measures would be taken to improve habitat quality within 2 miles of greater sage-grouse leks on an as-needed basis.

Greater Sage-Grouse Winter Concentration Areas. Disruptive activities would be prohibited in greater sage-grouse winter concentration areas (Map 7) from November 15 to April 30.

All Greater Sage-Grouse Habitats (Leks, Nesting, Early Brood-Rearing, and Winter Concentration Areas). In addition to Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2), seasonal limitations may be excepted provided criteria in the Procedures for Processing Proposals for Land Use Authorizations in Areas of Seasonal Restriction (Appendix 4) can be met, and appropriate mitigation can be implemented (Appendix 6) as determined by BLM in coordination with commodity users and other appropriate entities.

Big Game Winter Range. Disruptive activities would be prohibited in big game (elk, deer, and antelope) crucial winter range between November 15 and April 30 (Map 7). Seasonal limitations may be excepted provided criteria in the Procedures for Processing Applications in Areas of Seasonal Restriction (Appendix 4) can be met and appropriate mitigation can be implemented (as determined by BLM in coordination with commodity users).

Big Game Birthing Areas. Surface disturbing and disruptive activities and the amount of habitat disturbed would be limited in big game birthing areas from May 1 to June 30.

Black-Footed Ferret. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2)

Mountain Plover. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2)

Game Fish and Special Status Fish Species. Seasonal limitations for surface disturbing activities to protect game and special status fish species during spawning would be applied as necessary.

Raptor Nesting Sites. In addition to Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2), permanent or high profile structures would be prohibited within a specified distance of active raptor nests. Distance would be determined on a case-by-case basis and would depend on the raptor species involved, natural topographic barriers, line-of-sight distances, and other such factors. Temporary disturbances associated with placement of facilities, such as pipelines, as well as other actions, such as seismic activities, may be allowed within ½ to 1 mile of active raptor nests.

Disruptive activities would be seasonally restricted within a ½- to 1-mile radius of occupied raptor nesting sites. Raptor nest surveys would be conducted within a 1-mile radius or linear distance of proposed surface uses or activities during raptor nesting season (see Table 2-3 for dates which vary by species). Seasonal limitations may be excepted provided criteria in the Procedures for Processing Applications in Areas of Seasonal Restriction (Appendix 4) can be met, and appropriate mitigation can be implemented (as determined by BLM in coordination with commodity users).

Introduction and Reintroduction of Species. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

2.3.3 Heritage Resources Management

Management actions for heritage resources would be implemented consistent with the land use decisions of the Green River RMP (Appendix 2).

Heritage Resources Protection. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Protection of Scientific Values. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

National Register Eligible Sites. In addition to Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2), sites eligible for inclusion in the NRHP under Criterion D, because of their scientific information content, would be surrounded by a 100-foot avoidance area, pursuant to the Protocol Agreement between BLM and Wyoming SHPO (Appendix 7).

Native American Sites. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Expansion Era Roads and Associated Sites. Expansion Era roads would be managed similar to the historic trails covered in the Oregon/Mormon Pioneer National Historic Trails Management Plan (BLM 1986). Prescriptions from that plan would be applied, although the ¼-mile protective setback might not always be applicable. Management actions would include development of activity plans with the objective of preserving the historical integrity of significant NRHP-contributing segments of the historic roads. Activity plans may include NRHP nomination of those Expansion Era roads that qualify.

Historic Livestock Management Sites. Some historic livestock management sites may be eligible for inclusion in the NRHP within the context of the development of pastoral agriculture in Wyoming and the Rocky Mountain regions. There are no special management or recognition provisions for these sites under existing management.

Native and Euro-American Sites. Historic and archaeological sites within the context of early contact between Native Americans and Euro-American peoples have been identified and understood in general

terms. Because of their importance, these sites would continue to be protected by provisions of the NHPA on a case-by-case basis.

Paleontological Sites. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Unique Geologic Features. All actions described for Boars Tusk and surrounding areas would be the same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Vehicular travel within ½ mile of the Pinnacles Geologic Feature, and including the feature, would be limited to designated roads and trails.

Tri-Territory Marker. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

2.3.4 Travel, Access, and Realty Management

Management actions for travel management, access, and realty in the planning area would be implemented consistent with the land use decisions of the Green River RMP (Appendix 2).

Transportation Planning. Transportation planning would provide for appropriate ingress, egress, and access routes that would follow BLM guidelines and road classifications defined in the Green River RMP (Appendix 12). Arterial roads would be high traffic volume roads that provide primary access to the planning area; collector roads would provide access to large blocks of land; local roads would serve smaller areas; and resource roads would provide access to resource locations.

Travel Management Plan. A travel management plan would not be developed.

Road Installations. Proposed road installations and improvements would follow the Green River RMP management objectives and applicable BLM guidelines.

Geophysical Activities. Geophysical activities would conform to the OHV designations of the Green River RMP. Exceptions may be granted on a case-by-case basis, with appropriate limitations to protect sensitive resources. Detonation activities would not be allowed in areas of sensitive heritage resources and geologic features, such as Boars Tusk, White Mountain Petroglyphs, and historic trails. Geophysical vehicle use would not occur in areas closed to OHV use (Map 9). Geophysical exploration and related detonation activities would be prohibited in WSAs.

Rights-of-Way. The right-of-way restrictions listed in the Green River RMP would apply as applicable to utilities and other realty actions. Areas would be designated as right-of-way avoidance or exclusion areas based the location of specific sensitive resources (Map 8). Map 8 includes the right-of-way avoidance and exclusion areas identified in the Green River RMP. The Tri-Territory Marker and White Mountain Petroglyphs would remain right-of-way exclusion areas. The Steamboat Mountain ACEC would remain closed to communication sites.

Linear Rights-of-Way. No specific actions would be applied to locate linear rights-of-way adjacent to existing roads, trails, or similar facilities.

Winter Access. Winter access would be subject to seasonal road closures. Plowing of roads during the winter would be considered on a case-by-case basis.

OHV Management. In addition to Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2), the OHV decisions in the Green River RMP would be implemented. Specific roads and trails may be seasonally closed to OHV use on an as-needed basis for public health and safety reasons, for restoration or remediation actions, for wildlife or wildlife habitat protection, or for other reasons as determined by BLM (Map 9).

Over-the-Snow Vehicles. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Land Withdrawals and Exchanges. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Ownership Adjustments. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Access. In addition to Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2), access to public, state, and private land would be provided throughout the planning area and would be restricted only where necessary to protect public health and safety as well as to protect sensitive resources. Access decisions would be consistent with existing regulatory requirements and would be made for the purposes of providing for the reasonable use and enjoyment of inholdings. Access needs would be considered on a case-by-case basis.

2.3.5 Recreation Resources Management

Management actions for recreation resources management in the planning area would be implemented consistent with the land use decisions of the Green River RMP (Appendix 2).

Backcountry Byways. In addition to Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2), public information and education activities would be developed for backcountry byways (Tri-Territory Loop and Red Desert) and would include the development and installation of interpretive and directional signs and the development of recreation project plans. The location of the signs would be coordinated with state and local governments and other interested parties for the Red Desert view point from the dugway of Steamboat Mountain and for the Chicken Springs overlook. Other locations may be identified through coordination with state and local governments and interested parties. Site-specific recreation activity or implementation plans would be prepared as appropriate or necessary.

Greater Sand Dunes Recreation Area. The parking area and camping facilities in the Greater Sand Dunes Recreation Area would be expanded. This would include developing a recreation site plan and addressing public health and safety, resolving user conflict, and protecting adjoining resources.

Recreation Project Plans. In addition to Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2), a recreation project plan and interpretive prospectus would be developed, as necessary, for wild horse viewing areas.

Camping. In addition to Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2), overnight camping would be allowed throughout the planning area, including WSAs, in accordance with BLM guidelines. Dispersed camping would be allowed within 200 feet of a water source except where necessary to protect water quality and wildlife and livestock watering areas. Camping designations are a discretionary action approved by a BLM Authorized Officer. Areas would be closed to camping if resource damage occurs.

Special Recreation Use Permits. In addition to Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2), special recreation use permits would be reviewed and issued. The current permit evaluation process considers the nature of the event, potential impacts to resources, conflicts with other events, and impacts to the quality of other visitors' experiences. Mitigation measures necessary to protect the resources would be included in any permit issued. A Plan of Operation would be required for all commercial recreational operators and outfitters. The Plan of Operation would describe the type, extent, and location of the recreation use and the mechanisms by which the operator/outfitter would prevent impacts to environmental resources. Any requests in special recreation use permit applications to remove natural resources would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis after an environmental analysis process.

Recreational Mining and Other Similar Activity. Recreational mining and other similar activities would be allowed throughout the planning area that are not withdrawn from mineral location, where such withdrawals would not be pursued, or where not closed or restricted by Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) Guideline 19 (Non-coal: Non-commercial Recreation Panning and Dredging). A withdrawal is in place for the White Mountain Petroglyphs ACEC. Withdrawals would be pursued for the western portion of the Greater Sand Dunes ACEC, special status plant species locations, Crookston Ranch, public water reserves, Tri-Territory Marker, and South Pass Summit.

2.3.6 Minerals and Alternative Energy Resources Management

Management decisions in the Green River RMP on leasing fluid minerals and on locatable minerals were deferred for a portion of the JMH CAP planning area, referred to as the core area. These deferrals were necessary because information concerning potential mineral leasing or locations for mining claims was not yet sufficiently developed for making sound management decisions for the core area. Management actions for Mineral and Alternative Energy Resources Management in the planning area would be implemented consistent with the land use decisions of the Green River RMP (Appendix 2).

2.3.6.1 Leasable Fluid Minerals Management

Oil and Gas Leases. In addition to Actions Common to All Alternatives, existing leases that were suspended during the JMH CAP planning process would be reinstated. New leases would be offered outside the core area based on industry interest and resource development potential (Map 10). The core area would be closed to leasing, and no new leases would be issued in the core area.

Lease Stipulations. In addition to Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2), stipulations would be placed on new leases to protect sensitive resources and land uses identified in the Green River RMP (Appendix 2).

Stipulations limiting surface disturbance would be included as a standard provision on all new oil and gas leases offered by the RSFO. Stipulations would prevent surface disturbing activities, such as road, pipeline, or well pad construction, within certain areas unless site-specific mitigation is proposed and approved or a unless a site-specific analysis indicates that the activity would not cause unacceptable levels of impact to other resources. Stipulations would not allow surface disturbing activities to occur—

- In areas with a surface slope in excess of 25 percent
- In Class I and Class II VRM areas
- Within 500 feet of surface water or riparian areas
- Within ¼ mile or visual horizon (whichever is closer) from a historical trail
- During periods when soil material is saturated or frozen or when watershed damage is likely to occur.

Stipulations restricting the timing of development activity to protect wildlife resources would also be included as a standard provision in new oil and gas leases offered in the planning area. Access into certain areas for the construction of drilling pads and for drilling activities would be limited during specific times of the year to prevent impacts based on wildlife seasonal patterns and habitat use. Timing restrictions would not apply to maintenance and operation of producing wells. These stipulations include—

- Drilling and other surface disturbing activity would not be allowed from November 15 to April 30 within areas specified as important big game ungulate winter habitat. This restriction also applies to elk calving areas from May 1 to June 30.
- Drilling and other surface disturbing activity would not be allowed from February 1 to July 31 within areas specified as important raptor and/or sage- and sharp-tailed grouse nesting habitat.
- No surface occupancy would be allowed within portions of leases specified as requiring this protection for identified habitat protection (such as threatened or endangered species habitat) that cannot be protected by seasonal restrictions.

An Authorized Officer of BLM may provide exceptions to any of these limitations when considering an application. Exceptions could be approved if site-specific information indicates that changes to wildlife protection stipulations would not result in unacceptable impacts to wildlife (Appendix 4).

Drilling Permits. In addition to Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2), BLM specialists would review sensitive resources with lease operators to develop and implement protection measures to allow for effective development operations where impacts could be avoided or mitigated.

COAs for APDs would be based on site-specific analysis and would include general surface control, avoidance, and other requirements for mitigation of development impacts consistent with the Green River RMP.

Mitigation requirements, such as seasonal restrictions on drilling, may be required as a result of a site-specific analysis. Stipulations on existing leases could be excepted where site-specific analyses do not identify the presence of the resource of concern addressed by the stipulation (Appendix 4). For existing leases with current standard stipulations, exceptions would be allowed when site-specific analyses show no unacceptable impacts to sensitive resources would occur.

Well spacing requirements for oil and gas resource protection would defer to the Wyoming Oil and Gas Conservation Commission guidance, with consideration for surface resource values.

2.3.6.2 Leasable Solid Minerals Management

Exploration. In addition to Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2), lands outside the Coal Occurrence and Development Potential Area that have not gone through the 20-point screening process would be open for coal exploration unless specifically closed to coal and sodium exploration (Map 11). Exploration proposals would be allowed in open areas on a case-by-case basis, along with mitigation requirements to protect sensitive resources. Areas identified in the Green River RMP as being closed to coal exploration include wetlands, 100-year floodplains, riparian areas, Oregon Buttes ACEC, White Mountain Petroglyphs vista, Boars Tusk, Crookston Ranch, Tri-Territory Marker, raptor nesting sites, greater sage-grouse leks with a ¼-mile buffer, South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC (visible portion), special status plant species sites, Steamboat Mountain ACEC (outside the area with coal recommendations), and WSAs.

Leasing. Lands within the Coal Occurrence and Development Potential Area have been identified as having a known or assumed potential for coal development. These lands are reviewed against 20 criteria to determine whether the lands would be suitable for development (43 CFR 3461). The criteria consider existing resource values such as heritage resources, scenic values, wildlife, threatened and endangered species, natural landmarks, and watersheds. The coal planning decisions made in the GRRMP apply (see Appendix 2). Lands within the planning area with coal development potential (Map 56) have been through the 20-point unsuitability criteria screening and multiple-use conflict analysis. Areas closed to coal leasing (unsuitable) include the western portion of Greater Sand Dunes ACEC, which includes the Sand Dunes WSA (Map 6). Lands within the planning area that have been through the 20-point unsuitability criteria screening process and would be acceptable for further coal leasing and development consideration (with appropriate conditions) are shown on Map 6.

Important geological, ecological, and historic resources would be open to consideration for coal leasing and development by subsurface mining methods. Such areas acceptable for coal leasing with NSO requirements include Boars Tusk and Crookston Ranch. Areas acceptable for coal development by subsurface mining and controls on surface facilities include Steamboat Mountain ACEC, the eastern part of Greater Sand Dunes ACEC, Tri-Territory Marker, and raptor nest sites with a ½- to 1-mile buffer.

2.3.6.3 Locatable Minerals Management

Locatable Mineral Withdrawals. Specific lands within the planning area would be withdrawn from mineral location as identified in the Green River RMP (Map 5). Other withdrawals could be pursued as necessary.

Withdrawals would be revoked for lands classified as prospectively valuable for oil shale. Upon revocation, the area would be open to the filing of mining claims, exploration, and development of locatable minerals. The White Mountain Petroglyphs ACEC and Boars Tusk located in the oil shale classification lands would be withdrawn from mineral location prior to the revocation.

Withdrawals would be revoked for lands classified as prospectively valuable for coal. Upon revocation, the area would be open to the filing of mining claims, exploration, and development of all locatable minerals. Areas that would be withdrawn from mineral location prior to the revocation of the coal classification include Greater Sand Dunes ACEC (western portion), special status plant sites, Crookston Ranch, public water reserves, Tri-Territory Marker, and South Pass Summit.

In areas open to mineral location, mining claims could be filed which would allow that claim to be held and developed in accordance with applicable regulations (39 CFR 3809). Mining activities would also have to comply with other regulatory requirements, including limitations on air and water discharges, waste management, spill prevention, and endangered species.

2.3.6.4 Salable Minerals Management

Mineral Material Sales. Salable minerals are common use minerals, such as sand and gravel, which can be purchased from the Government on federal lands. The planning area would be open to consideration of mineral material sales except for areas identified as closed to sales, or where development of salable minerals would cause unacceptable impacts (Map 12). Areas closed to mineral material sales include WSAs, Steamboat Mountain ACEC, South Pass Summit, Crookston Ranch, Native American burial sites, Oregon Buttes ACEC, Boars Tusk, White Mountain Petroglyphs, Greater Sand Dunes ACEC, South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC (visible portion), raptor nest sites, and special status plant sites.

Sale areas, community pits, and common use areas would be developed for salable minerals at locations that are compatible with other resources and land uses. Mining and reclamation plans would be required for each proposed sale area and use, and management of the area would be in conformance with other resource protection requirements, including Standard Practices, Best Management Practices, and Guidelines for Surface Disturbing Activities (Appendices 5 and 6).

2.3.6.5 Alternative Energy Management

There were no similar land management decisions made in the Green River RMP.

2.3.7 Visual Resources Management

The planning area would be managed to maintain or improve scenic quality by managing the impacts of human activities and other intrusions on the visual landscape (Map 13). The VRM classes provide the design standards for all surface disturbing projects. Projects would be designed, sited, screened, or painted to reduce visual impacts regardless of the VRM classification. Management actions for VRM in the planning area would be implemented consistent with the land use decisions of the Green River RMP (Appendix 2).

VRM Class I Areas. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

VRM Class II Areas. Management actions on lands classified as VRM Class II would be designed to retain the existing character of the landscape. A visual transition area of 1 mile adjacent to each WSA would be managed as Class II to retain the existing character of the WSA landscape. A low level of change would be acceptable to the characteristic landscapes of the ACECs, thus South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC, White Mountain Petroglyphs, Greater Sand Dunes ACEC, and the southern portion of Steamboat Mountain ACEC would be managed as Class II. Surface disturbing activities could be seen in these areas but would not attract the attention of the casual observer. Oregon Buttes ACEC lies entirely within the WSA and thus would be managed as VRM Class I.

VRM Class III Areas. Management actions on lands classified as VRM Class III would be designed to partially retain the existing character of the landscape and would allow a moderate level of change. The northern portion of Steamboat Mountain ACEC, the portion of White Mountain that falls within the southwest corner of the planning area, Split Rock, Eden Valley, and the western part of Red Desert Watershed that is included in the planning area would be managed as Class III. Surface disturbing activities could attract attention but would not dominate the view of the casual observer.

VRM Class IV Areas. Management actions on lands classified as VRM Class IV could result in a major modification to the existing character of the landscape. The level of change to the landscape could be high. The remainder of the planning area not managed as VRM Class I, II, or III would be managed as Class IV. Surface disturbing activities could dominate the view of the casual observer and would be the major focus of attention.

2.3.8 Management of Special Management Areas and Other Management Areas

The special management areas would continue to be managed to preserve and protect the integrity and character of the specific areas in accordance with ACEC policies and WSA interim management policies. Management actions for special management areas in the planning area would be implemented consistent with the land use decisions of the Green River RMP (Appendix 2).

The designation, boundaries, and management prescriptions of Steamboat Mountain, Greater Sand Dunes, Oregon Buttes, and South Pass Historic Landscape ACECs, as well as the seven WSAs, would remain unchanged. The location and size of the Special Status Plant Species ACEC would remain unchanged but could be expanded in the JMH CAP planning area on a case-by-case basis.

2.3.8.1 Special Management Areas

2.3.8.1.1 Wilderness Study Areas

Geophysical Activities. Geophysical exploration and related detonation activities would be prohibited within these areas.

Locatable Minerals. A plan of operations would be required for all activities greater than casual use.

2.3.8.1.2 Oregon Buttes ACEC

Geophysical Activities. Geophysical activities and related detonation activities would be prohibited in Oregon Buttes ACEC.

Rights-of-Way. The ACEC would be managed as a right-of-way avoidance area.

Recreation. A recreation project plan and interpretive prospectus would be developed, as necessary, for Oregon Buttes.

Locatable Minerals. A plan of operations would be required for all activities greater than casual use.

2.3.8.1.3 South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC

Rights-of-Way. The South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC (portion not visible) would be managed as a right-of-way avoidance area. The South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC (visible portion) would be managed as a right-of way exclusion area.

OHV Use. OHV use within South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC (visible portion) would be limited to designated roads and trails. OHV use within South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC (non-visible portion) would be limited to existing roads and trails.

Leasable Fluid Minerals. The South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC (visible portion) would be open to consideration of to fluid minerals leasing with NSO requirements.

Leasable Solid Minerals. The South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC (visible portion) would be closed to leasable solid minerals exploration and leasing.

Locatable Minerals. Withdrawals from mineral location would be pursued on South Pass Summit.

VRM. The South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC would be managed as a VRM Class II area.

The South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC viewshed would be maintained from approximately 3 miles of the Oregon, Mormon Pioneer, Pony Express, and California National Historic Trail routes. Intrusions within the viewshed area could be allowed provided the results of a visual analysis indicate they are not visible from the trail routes or that they can be mitigated.

2.3.8.1.4 White Mountain Petroglyphs ACEC

Recreation. A recreation project plan and interpretive prospectus would be developed, as necessary.

Leasable Fluid Minerals. The ACEC would be open to consideration of fluid minerals leasing with NSO requirements.

Leasable Solid Minerals. White Mountain Petroglyphs vista would be closed to coal and sodium exploration.

VRM. The ACEC would be managed as a VRM Class II area.

2.3.8.1.5 Steamboat Mountain ACEC

The Steamboat Mountain ACEC designation and boundaries would remain unchanged (Map 14).

Rights-of-Way. The ACEC would be managed as a right-of-way avoidance area.

Communication Sites. Communication sites would be prohibited in Steamboat Mountain ACEC.

OHV Use. OHV use would be limited to designated roads and trails.

Recreation. The location of interpretive and directional signs along backcountry byways would be coordinated with state and local governments and other interested parties for the Red Desert viewpoint from dugway of Steamboat Mountain.

A recreation project plan and interpretive prospectus would be developed, as necessary, for Steamboat Mountain.

Leasable Solid Minerals. The portions of Steamboat Mountain ACEC within the coal development potential area would be open to leasable solid minerals exploration and leasing using only subsurface mining methods and controls on surface facilities (Map 6). Those portions outside the coal development potential area would be closed to leasable solid minerals exploration and leasing (Maps 6 and Map 11).

Salable Minerals. The ACEC would be closed to mineral material sales.

VRM. The southern portion of the ACEC would be managed as a VRM Class II area. The northern portion would be managed as VRM class III area.

2.3.8.1.6 Greater Sand Dunes ACEC

The Greater Sand Dunes ACEC designation and boundaries would remain unchanged.

Rights-of-Way. The ACEC would be managed as a right-of-way avoidance area (within 1 mile or the visual horizon, whichever is closer).

OHV Use. The portion of the ACEC containing the Greater Sand Dunes Recreation Area would be open to OHV use. The remainder of the ACEC would be limited to existing roads and trails.

Recreation. A recreation site plan would be prepared for expansion of the parking area and camping facilities at the Greater Sand Dunes Recreation Area. The plan would address public health and safety, resolving user conflicts, and protecting adjoining resources.

Leasable Solid Minerals. The western portion of the ACEC would be closed to leasable solid minerals exploration and leasing.

The eastern portion of the ACEC within the coal development potential area would be open to leasable solid minerals exploration and leasing using only subsurface mining methods and controls on surface facilities.

Locatable Minerals. Withdrawals from mineral location would be pursued in the western portion of the ACEC.

VRM. The ACEC would be managed as a VRM Class II area.

2.3.8.1.7 Special Status Plants ACEC

The Special Status Plant Species ACEC (per the Green River RMP) could be expanded into the Jack Morrow Hills CAP area on a case-by-case basis.

Rights-of-Way. Areas where special status plant species occur would be managed as rights-of-way avoidance areas.

OHV Use. Areas where special status plant species occur would be closed to OHV use.

Leasable Minerals. Known locations of special status plant species would be open to consideration for mineral leasing with NSO requirements.

Leasable Solid Minerals. Areas where special status plant species occur would be closed to coal and sodium exploration as identified in the Green River RMP.

Salable Minerals. Areas where special status plant species occur would be closed to mineral material sales.

Rangeland Management. Salt or mineral supplements would not be allowed in areas where special status plant species occur.

Vegetation treatments would be designed to protect and conform to special status plant species.

2.3.8.2 Other Management Areas

2.3.8.2.1 Pinnacles Geologic Feature

The Pinnacles Geologic Feature would continue to be managed as part of the Red Desert Watershed Management Area, as provided in the Green River RMP.

OHV Use. OHV use would be limited to designated roads and trails.

VRM. The area would be managed as a VRM Class III area.

2.3.8.2.2 Pinnacles Geographic Area

The Pinnacles Geographic Area would continue to be managed as part of the Red Desert Watershed Management Area, as provided in the Green River RMP.

2.3.8.2.3 Red Desert Watershed Management Area

OHV Use. OHV use would be limited to designated roads and trails.

VRM. The area would be managed as a VRM Class III area.

2.4 ALTERNATIVE 1

Alternative 1 provides expanded opportunities to use and develop the planning area, more so than all the other alternatives. This alternative emphasizes development and intensive management and de-emphasizes environmental protection. Resources would still be protected to the extent required by applicable laws and regulations. Development and activities would occur throughout the planning area provided the actions were also in accordance with existing BLM guidelines. However, this alternative could result in modifications or amendments to decisions in the Green River RMP.

2.4.1 Management Actions Common to All Resource or Land Use Programs

Monitoring Plan. An interdisciplinary monitoring plan would be developed to evaluate the overall effectiveness of implementing the management decisions for the planning area. Site-specific monitoring plans would be developed for project proposals.

2.4.2 Land and Water Resources Management

2.4.2.1 General Management Actions for Land and Water Resources

Healthy Rangelands. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Proper Functioning Condition. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2)

Desired Plant Community. Similar to the No Action Alternative, upland and riparian vegetation would be managed to achieve DPC objectives. The DPC objectives would emphasize commodity uses while complying with existing regulations pertaining to sensitive resources.

Vegetation Treatments. In addition to Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2), all methods of vegetative treatments would be considered on a case-by-case basis, without a preference for one type or another.

Fences. Fences on public lands would be modified or reconstructed where documented wildlife conflicts with fencing occur. Fence construction would be in accordance with BLM design standards, with no special consideration for location.

Watershed Health Assessments. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Native Vegetation. No special emphasis would be placed on mountain shrub, basin big sagebrush/lemon scurfpea, aspen, or other unique or important vegetation types.

2.4.2.2 Fire Management

Fire Management Implementation Plan. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Fire Suppression. Similar to the No Action Alternative, full fire suppression for basin big sagebrush/lemon scurfpea vegetation associations would be applied.

2.4.2.3 Water Resources Management

Water Quality. In addition to Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2), areas with highly erodible soils, the area within 250 feet of wetlands, riparian areas and 100-year floodplains, and the area within 50 feet of the edge of the inner gorge of intermittent and large ephemeral drainages would be avoidance areas for surface disturbing activities. Surface disturbing activities could be permitted within avoidance areas provided that a mitigation plan is approved and a site-specific analysis determines that adverse impacts would not occur as a result of the activity.

Permanent Facilities. In addition to Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2), new permanent facilities would be allowed in floodplains provided there are no practicable alternatives (Executive Order 11988), and appropriate mitigation measures would be implemented.

Erosion Control. Same as described for the No Action Alternative (Section 2.3).

Colorado River Salinity Control. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Wetlands and Floodplains. In addition to Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2), projects to improve the ecological integrity of the dunal ponds would be considered for development on BLM-administered public lands, as described in the No Action Alternative.

Riparian Management Exclosures. In addition to Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2), existing exclosures could be removed and the area made available for livestock grazing. New exclosures would be considered only if they benefit commodity uses.

Fluid Mineral Wells. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Aquifer Recharge Areas. Aquifer recharge areas would be managed to maintain or enhance recharge volume and ground water quality by limiting the amount of impermeable surfaces in the recharge areas.

2.4.2.4 Wild Horses Management

Wild Horse Herd Management Area Boundaries and Appropriate Management Levels. The management actions for wild horses would be the same as those of the No Action Alternative (Section 2.3).

Activity and Monitoring Plans. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Water Developments. Same as described in the No Action Alternative (Section 2.3).

Gathering Plan. Same as described in the No Action Alternative (Section 2.3).

Public Education. Same as described in the No Action Alternative (Section 2.3).

2.4.2.5 Livestock Grazing Management

Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Rangeland and Riparian Habitat. In addition to Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2), grazing management systems (AMP) would assist in improving or maintaining the desired range condition. Reductions of active AUMs would not be implemented unless they are the only appropriate action for meeting the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands.

Forage Utilization Levels. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Livestock Water Developments and Range Improvements. Livestock water developments and range improvements would be considered to enhance livestock production. Compatibility with special status plant species would be required.

Salt or Mineral Supplements. Salt or mineral supplements would be prohibited within 250 feet of riparian habitat and national and scenic trails unless analysis shows that these resources would not be adversely affected. Supplements would also be prohibited on areas inhabited by special status plant species, regardless of analysis findings.

2.4.2.6 Vegetation Management

Special Status Plant Species. In addition to Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2), the management actions for vegetation would be similar to the No Action Alternative (Section 2.3). The one exception to the actions involves special status plant species. Only locations of federally listed, proposed, or candidate species would be avoided or closed from surface disturbing activities until protective measures are developed with the USFWS. Surface disturbing activities would avoid locations of Wyoming BLM sensitive plant species.

Rights-of-Way Limitations. Same as described in the No Action Alternative (Section 2.3).

Fire Suppression. Same as described in the No Action Alternative (Section 2.3).

Threatened and Endangered Plant Species. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Invasive Species. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Forest and Woodland Health. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

2.4.2.7 Wildlife Habitat Management

Habitat Management Plan. Same as described in the No Action Alternative (Section 2.3).

Water Developments. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Special Status Wildlife Species. Actions relative to special status species would be the same as described in the No Action Alternative, except only locations of federally listed, proposed, or candidate species would require species-specific mitigation measures as developed with USFWS. Survey protocol for the black-footed ferret would be conducted consistent with USFWS requirements detailed in the No Action Alternative.

Sensitive Habitat. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2), except appropriate distance, seasonal limitations, and mitigation measures would only be applied to greater sage-grouse leks and winter range, mountain plover aggregation areas, and raptor nesting sites. Limitations on surface disturbing activities for Alternative 1 include seasonal limitations and CSU requirements. NSO (in relation to wildlife) would not apply under this alternative (Map 16). The seasonal limitations for Alternative 1 are shown in Table 2-3.

Predator Damage Control. Same as described in the No Action Alternative (Section 2.3).

Greater Sage-Grouse Leks, Nesting, and Early Brood-rearing Habitat. These areas would be managed as similar to the No Action Alternative, except that seasonal limitations for disruptive activities would be determined on a case-by-case basis. Seasonal limitations on surface disturbing and disruptive activities (usually from March 15 to July 15) would apply within actual nesting and early brood-rearing habitat up to 1 mile from greater sage-grouse leks on a case-by-case basis (Map 16). Nesting and early brood-rearing habitats would be protected from habitat degradation, and measures would be taken to improve habitat quality within 1 mile of greater sage-grouse leks on an as-needed basis.

Greater Sage-Grouse Winter Range. No actions would be taken specific to these areas.

All Greater Sage-Grouse Habitats (Leks, Nesting, Early Brood-Rearing, and Winter Range). Same as described in the No Action Alternative (Section 2.3).

Big Game Winter Range. No seasonal limitations would be applied to these areas.

Big Game Birthing Areas. No seasonal limitations would be applied to these areas.

Black-Footed Ferret. In addition to Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2), measures would be taken, as appropriate, to reduce potential raptor perches in and around prairie dog towns and colonies.

Mountain Plover. In addition to Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2), active mountain plover nesting aggregation areas (Map 17) would be avoidance areas for surface disturbing and disruptive activities from April 10 to July 10.

Game Fish and Special Status Fish Species. No seasonal limitations would be applied to these areas.

Raptor Nesting Sites. In addition to Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2), disruptive activities would be prohibited within a ¼-mile radius of occupied raptor nest sites during the nesting season (February 1 to July 31).

Introduction and Reintroduction of Species. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

2.4.3 Heritage Resources Management

Heritage Resources Protection. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Protection of Scientific Values. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

National Register Eligible Sites. Management of heritage resources would include inventories and mitigation as needed for specific projects. An appropriate level of analysis of all surface disturbing activities would be conducted to determine the potential effect of the activity on the heritage resource and its eligibility for listing on the NRHP. Similar to the No Action Alternative, all National Register-eligible historic sites would continue to be protected through provisions of the NHPA and ARPA. Sites eligible for inclusion in the NRHP under Criterion D would be surrounded by a 100-foot avoidance area. Site stewardship and public education aspects of the heritage resource management program would also be pursued.

Native American Sites. Management would be the same as described in the No Action Alternative.

Expansion Era Roads and Associated Sites. As described in the No Action Alternative, Expansion Era roads and associated sites (e.g., Freighter Gap), stage stations, and freighter's camps would be protected under provisions of the NHPA.

Historic Livestock Management Sites. NRHP-eligible historic livestock management sites would be protected from surface-disturbing activities. The area to be protected would be determined on a case-by-case basis.

Native and Euro-American Sites. Interpretive signs would be placed where development activities occur adjacent to these areas. No specific protection measures would be applied other than provisions under the NHPA.

Paleontological Sites. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Unique Geologic Features. Management would be the same as described in the No Action Alternative.

Tri-Territory Marker. Management would be the same as described in the No Action Alternative.

2.4.4 Travel, Access, and Realty Management

Transportation Planning. Transportation planning would be the same as described for the No Action Alternative.

Travel Management Plan. A travel management plan for the JMH CAP area would not be developed. In the Steamboat Mountain ACEC and White Mountain area, travel management activities would follow the OHV designations for these areas.

Road Installations. Travel planning, access limitations, and realty actions would be consistent with existing regulatory requirements and the Green River Basin Advisory Council (GRBAC) recommendations. These recommendations addressed limiting road design standards to accommodate

only the intended function of the road, flexibility in placing gathering pipelines, and a road signage system.

Geophysical Activities. Geophysical and related detonation activities would be allowed throughout the planning area subject to the seasonal limitations identified in Wildlife Habitat Management (Section 2.4.2.7) and the limitations for sensitive plant species locations.

Rights-of-Way. Areas would be designated as right-of-way avoidance or exclusion areas based the location of specific sensitive resources (Map 18). The extent of right-of-way exclusion areas would be limited to the Tri-Territory Marker and White Mountain Petroglyphs. Rights-of-way avoidance areas would include sensitive geologic and historic features, vegetation, and wildlife habitat. No additional linear right-of-way restrictions would apply in the planning area. The Steamboat Mountain ACEC would be open to consideration for communication sites.

Linear Rights-of-Way. Same as described for the No Action Alternative (Section 2.3).

Winter Access. Winter access would be limited only by weather conditions. Seasonal road closures would not be implemented. Plowing of roads would be allowed as needed for all uses.

OHV Management. Public lands in the JMH CAP planning area would remain open, limited, or closed (Map 19). The OHV management prescriptions would limit access to designated roads and trails in the Pinnacles Geologic Feature and the visible portion of the South Pass Historic Landscape. The WSAs and specific sensitive resource areas would be closed. Seasonal restrictions would be implemented in specific habitat areas of greater sage-grouse, raptors, and mountain plover on an as-needed basis. The Greater Sand Dunes recreation area would remain open.

Over-the-Snow Vehicles. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Land Withdrawals and Exchanges. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Ownership Adjustments. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Access. In addition to Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2), access to public, state, and private land would be provided throughout the planning area and would be restricted only where necessary to protect public health and safety and to protect sensitive resources. Access would be limited on a case-by-case basis to protect sensitive resources in areas of high development potential.

2.4.5 Recreation Resources Management

Management of recreation resources would provide for continued availability of passive and active outdoor opportunities while protecting environmental resources and ensuring the health and safety of users. The maximum degree of public access possible would be accommodated based on OHV designations for the planning area.

Backcountry Byways. Backcountry byways would be managed as described for the No Action Alternative.

Greater Sand Dunes Recreation Area. The parking area and camping facilities at the Greater Sand Dunes Recreation Area would be maintained in their current condition. To avoid conflicts with increased fluid minerals development and to protect the health and safety of users, the recreation area would not be expanded or improved to accommodate additional users.

Recreation Project Plans. Same as described for the No Action Alternative (Section 2.3).

Camping. Same as described for the No Action Alternative (Section 2.3).

Special Recreation Use Permits. Same as described for the No Action Alternative (Section 2.3).

Recreational Mining and Other Similar Activity. Same as described for the No Action Alternative (Section 2.3).

Recreational mining and other similar activities would be allowed in those parts of the planning area that are not withdrawn from mineral location or where such withdrawals would not be pursued. Withdrawn areas include the White Mountain Petroglyphs ACEC. Withdrawals would be pursued for Special Status Plant Species locations, the western portion of the Greater Sand Dunes ACEC, Crookston Ranch, public water reserves, Tri-Territory Marker, and South Pass Summit.

2.4.6 Minerals and Alternative Energy Resources Management

This alternative would provide for leasing and permitting of mineral development to the degree possible consistent with existing regulatory requirements and statutory withdrawals and closures.

2.4.6.1 Leasable Fluid Minerals Management

Oil and Gas Leases. In addition to Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2), new leases would be offered throughout the planning area, including the core area, based on industry interest and development potential (Map 20). Suspended leases in the planning area would be reinstated and APDs considered, consistent with existing lease stipulations. Interest in new leasing by prospective developers would be used to identify the parts of the planning area that would be offered in lease sales.

Lease Stipulations. The stipulations applied to new leases would be limited to compliance with existing legal requirements for environmental protection.

Drilling Permits. New development activities could be approved through the APD process (Appendix 14). The COAs that would be placed on APDs would require mitigation to protect other resources as required by the regulations for oil and gas development in 43 CFR 3100. The APDs would be required to show the location of surface disturbing activities, and any mitigation measures would be based on site-specific analysis of resources in the lease area. Mitigation measures would be consistent with regulatory standards and the minimum avoidance distances needed to protect identified habitat would be specified in COAs.

Mitigation requirements, such as seasonal restrictions on drilling, may be required as a result of a site-specific analysis. Stipulations on existing leases could be excepted when site-specific analyses do not identify the presence of the resource of concern addressed by the stipulation (Appendix 4). For existing leases with current standard stipulations, exceptions would be allowed when site-specific analyses show that no unacceptable impacts to sensitive resources would occur.

Well locations would be required to comply with Wyoming Oil and Gas Conservation Commission well spacing requirements. These requirements focus on the use and protection of the oil and gas subsurface resource and not on the use and protection of surface resource values.

2.4.6.2 Leasable Solid Minerals Management

Exploration. The planning area would be open to coal exploration activities, with avoidance and right-of-way restrictions as needed to protect sensitive resources (Map 21). Coal and sodium exploration would be prohibited only in areas for which compliance with existing regulatory limitations is required, including WSAs. In areas where surface disturbing activities are limited to protect other resources, those limitations would apply to coal exploration activities, such as drilling of test holes and collection of core samples. Surface disturbing activities related to coal exploration would comply with existing standard practices, best management practices, and guidelines for surface disturbing activities (Appendixes 5, 6).

Leasing. Similar to the No Action Alternative, lands within the planning area having a known or assumed potential for coal development (Coal Occurrence and Development Potential Area) have been reviewed against 20 criteria to determine whether the lands would be suitable for development. Lands within the planning area with coal development potential (Map 56) have been through the 20-point unsuitability criteria screening and multiple-use conflict analysis. Areas closed to coal leasing (unsuitable) include the western portion of Greater Sand Dunes ACEC, which includes the Sand Dunes WSA (Map 22). Lands within the planning area that have been through the 20-point unsuitability criteria screening process and would be acceptable for further coal leasing and development consideration (with appropriate conditions) are shown on Map 22.

Restrictions on mining activity would be required on coal leases as needed to meet existing regulatory requirements for resource protection for threatened or endangered species habitat and cultural and historical resources. Such areas acceptable for coal leasing that would include NSO requirements include Boars Tusk and Crookston Ranch. Areas acceptable for coal development by subsurface mining and controls on surface facilities include Greater Sand Dunes ACEC (eastern portion), Tri-Territory Marker, and raptor nest sites with a ¼-mile buffer.

2.4.6.3 Locatable Minerals Management

Locatable Mineral Withdrawals. Similar to the No Action Alternative, the planning area would be open to filing claims, exploration, and development of locatable minerals with the exception of withdrawn areas (Map 23). Withdrawal from mineral location would be pursued for Indian Gap.

Withdrawals would be revoked for lands classified as prospectively valuable for oil shale. Upon revocation, the area would be open to the filing of mining claims, exploration, and development of locatable minerals. The White Mountain Petroglyphs ACEC and Boars Tusk located in the oil shale classification lands would be withdrawn from mineral location before the revocation.

Withdrawals would be revoked for lands classified as prospectively valuable for coal. Upon revocation, the area would be open to filing of mining claims, exploration, and development of all locatable minerals. Areas that would be withdrawn from mineral location before the revocation of the coal classification include the western portion of the Greater Sand Dunes ACEC, special status plant sites, Crookston Ranch, public water reserves, Tri-Territory Marker, and South Pass Summit.

2.4.6.4 Salable Minerals Management

Mineral Material Sales. Similar to the No Action Alternative, the planning area would be open to consideration of mineral material sales, except for areas identified as closed to sales or where development of salable minerals would cause unacceptable impacts (Map 24). Areas closed to mineral material sales include WSAs, Crookston Ranch, Oregon Buttes ACEC, Native American burial sites, South Pass Summit, Boars Tusk, White Mountain Petroglyphs, Greater Sand Dunes ACEC, South Pass Historic Landscape (visible portion), raptor nest sites, and special status plant sites.

2.4.6.5 Alternative Energy Management

Alternative Energy Proposals. The planning area would be open to alternative energy development, except where development would violate statutory resource protection requirements. Alternative energy resource development would not be allowed in areas where there would be unacceptable impacts to threatened or endangered species, and associated surface disturbing activities would comply with existing Standard Practices, Best Management Practices, and Guidelines for Surface Disturbing Activities (Appendices 5 and 6). Alternative energy developments would not be allowed to interfere with existing rights.

2.4.7 Visual Resources Management

The planning area would be managed to maintain or improve scenic quality by managing the impacts of human activities and other intrusions on the visual landscape (Map 25). The VRM classes provide the design standards for all surface disturbing projects. Projects would be designed, sited, screened, or painted to reduce visual impacts regardless of the VRM classification

VRM Class I Areas. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

VRM Class II Areas. Management actions on lands classified as VRM Class II would be designed for blending into the natural landscape. A visual transition area of 1 mile adjacent to each WSA would be managed as Class II to retain the existing character of the WSA landscape. A low level of change would be acceptable to the characteristic landscapes of the ACECs, thus South Pass Historic Landscape and White Mountain Petroglyphs ACECs, and the part of Greater Sand Dunes ACEC outside the WSA, would be managed as VRM Class II. Surface disturbing activities could be seen in these areas but would not attract the attention of the casual observer. Oregon Buttes ACEC lies entirely within the WSA and thus is managed as VRM Class I.

VRM Class III Areas. There would be no lands within the planning area classified as VRM Class III.

VRM Class IV Areas. The remainder of the planning area not managed as VRM Class I or II would be managed as Class IV. Management actions on lands classified as VRM Class IV could result in a major modification to the existing character of the landscape. The level of change to the landscape could be high. Surface disturbing activities could dominate the view of the casual observer and would be the major focus of attention.

2.4.8 Management of Special Management Areas and Other Management Areas

This alternative would provide for additional use and development in the special management areas consistent with existing regulatory requirements and statutory withdrawals and closures. The designation,

boundaries, and management prescriptions of the Greater Sand Dunes, Oregon Buttes, and South Pass Historic Landscape ACECs as well as the seven WSAs would remain unchanged (Map 26).

2.4.8.1 Special Management Areas

2.4.8.1.1 Wilderness Study Areas

Locatable Minerals. A plan of operations would be required for all activities greater than casual use.

2.4.8.1.2 Oregon Buttes ACEC

Rights-of-Way. The ACEC would be managed as a right-of-way avoidance area.

Recreation. A recreation project plan and interpretive prospectus would be developed, as necessary, for Oregon Buttes.

Locatable Minerals. A plan of operations would be required for all activities greater than casual use.

2.4.8.1.3 South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC

Rights-of-Way. The South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC would be managed as a right-of-way avoidance area.

OHV Use. OHV use within the South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC (visible portion) would be limited to designated roads and trails. OHV use within the nonvisible portion would be limited to existing roads and trails.

Leasable Solid Minerals. The ACEC would be open to leasable solid minerals exploration and leasing with avoidance and right-of-way limitations, as needed.

Locatable Minerals. Withdrawals from mineral location would be pursued on South Pass Summit.

VRM. The ACEC would be managed as a VRM Class II area.

The South Pass Historic Landscape viewshed would be reduced to approximately 1 mile in each direction from the center of the Oregon, Mormon Pioneer, California, and Pony Express trail routes. Intrusions within the viewshed area could be allowed provided the results of a visual analysis indicate they are not visible from the trail routes or that they can be mitigated.

2.4.8.1.4 White Mountain Petroglyphs ACEC

Recreation. A recreation project plan and interpretive prospectus would be developed, as necessary.

Leasable Fluid Minerals. The ACEC would be open to consideration of fluid minerals leasing with NSO requirements.

Leasable Solid Minerals. The ACEC would be open to coal and sodium exploration activities subject to avoidance and right-of-way limitations as needed.

VRM. The ACEC would be would be managed as a VRM Class II area.

2.4.8.1.5 Steamboat Mountain ACEC

The Steamboat Mountain ACEC designation would be removed.

Communication Sites. Communication sites would be considered on Steamboat Mountain.

OHV Use. OHV use would be limited to existing roads and trails.

Recreation. Location of interpretive and directional signs along backcountry byways would be coordinated with state and local governments and other interested parties for the Red Desert viewpoint from dugway of Steamboat Mountain.

A recreation project plan and interpretive prospectus would be developed, as necessary, for Steamboat Mountain.

Leasable Solid Minerals. The portions of Steamboat Mountain ACEC within the coal development potential area would be open to leasable solid minerals exploration and leasing using only subsurface mining methods and controls on surface facilities (Map 22). Those portions outside the coal development potential area would be closed to leasable solid minerals exploration and leasing (Map 21 and Map 22).

VRM. The ACEC would be managed as a VRM class IV area.

2.4.8.1.6 Greater Sand Dunes ACEC

The Greater Sand Dunes ACEC designation and boundaries would remain unchanged.

Rights-of-Way. The ACEC would be managed as a right-of-way avoidance area (with a 1-mile buffer).

OHV Use. The portion of the ACEC containing the Greater Sand Dunes Recreation Area would be open to OHV use. The remainder of the ACEC would be limited to existing roads and trails.

Leasable Solid Minerals. The western portion of the ACEC would be closed to leasable solid minerals exploration and leasing. The eastern portion of the ACEC within the coal development potential area would be open to leasable solid minerals exploration and leasing using only subsurface mining methods and controls on surface facilities.

Locatable Minerals. Withdrawals from mineral location would be pursued in the western portion of the ACEC.

VRM. The ACEC would be managed as VRM Class II area.

2.4.8.1.7 Special Status Plants ACEC

The Special Status Plant Species ACEC would not be expanded into the Jack Morrow Hills CAP area.

Rights-of-Way. Areas where special status plant species occur would be managed as rights-of-way avoidance areas.

OHV Use. Areas where special status plant species occur would be closed to OHV use.

Leasable Fluid Minerals. Known locations of special status plant species would be open to consideration for mineral leasing with NSO requirements.

Leasable Solid Minerals. Areas where special status plant species occur would be open to coal and sodium exploration subject to avoidance and right-of-way limitations as needed.

Salable Minerals. Areas where special status plant species occur would be closed to mineral material sales.

Rangeland Management. Salt or mineral supplements would not be allowed in areas where special status plant species occur.

2.4.8.2 Other Management Areas

2.4.8.2.1 Pinnacles Geologic Feature

The Pinnacles Geologic Feature would continue to be managed as part of the Red Desert Watershed Management Area.

OHV Use. OHV use would be limited to designated roads and trails.

VRM. The area would be managed as a VRM Class IV area.

2.4.8.2.2 Pinnacles Geographic Area

The Pinnacles Geographic Area would continue to be managed as part of the Red Desert Watershed Management Area, as provided in the Green River RMP.

2.5 ALTERNATIVE 2

Alternative 2 reduces opportunities to use and develop the planning area. The alternative focuses on improving and protecting habitat for wildlife and sensitive plant and animal species, improving riparian areas and water quality, and protecting historic, cultural, and Native American sites. Alternative 2 would not allow development in areas with competing resource uses and would close or designate portions of the planning area to restrict land uses. Development or activities could occur in specific portions of the planning area provided mitigation measures are implemented.

2.5.1 Management Actions Common to All Resource or Land Use Programs

Monitoring Plan. An interdisciplinary monitoring plan would be developed to evaluate the overall effectiveness of implementing the management decisions for the planning area. Site-specific monitoring plans would be developed for project proposals.

2.5.2 Land and Water Resources Management

2.5.2.1 General Management Actions for Land and Water Resources

Healthy Rangelands. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Proper Functioning Condition. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Desired Plant Community. In addition to Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2), vegetation structure for upland and riparian areas would be managed by DPC objectives that emphasize wildlife habitat, watershed resources, biodiversity values, and maintenance of habitat for special status species. Furthermore, natural plant succession would be promoted in native vegetation communities, with emphasis on mountain shrub, basin big sagebrush/lemon scurfpea, aspen, and other unique or important vegetation types.

Vegetation Treatments. In addition to Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2), vegetation treatments would be limited to noxious weed control and would be designed to protect water quality, dissipate erosion, and conform to requirements to protect special status plant species. Prescribed burns would not be considered. Areas treated with prescribed burns would be rested a minimum of two full growing seasons after treatment and fenced from livestock and big game animals if necessary.

Fences. Similar to the No Action Alternative, fences on public lands would be removed, modified, or reconstructed where documented wildlife conflicts with fencing occur. Fencing would also be used to limit wild horses to the modified boundary of the Great Divide Basin HMA (which excludes the JMH CAP planning area). Herding control of livestock would be encouraged as an alternative to fencing.

Watershed Health Assessments. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Native Vegetation. Same as described in the No Action Alternative (Section 2.3).

2.5.2.2 Fire Management

Fire Management Implementation Plan. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Wildland and Prescribed Fire. Prescribed burns would not be considered. Wildland fire would be managed within and outside prescription areas to improve biological diversity and the overall health of the public lands.

Fire Suppression. Limited fire suppression for basin big sagebrush/lemon scurfpea vegetation associations would be applied.

2.5.2.3 Water Resources Management

Water Quality. In addition to Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2), all surface disturbing activities would be required to adopt design strategies that serve to reduce erosion and maintain or improve water quality. The area within ¼-mile of wetlands, riparian areas, and 100-year floodplains would be avoidance areas for surface disturbing activities.

Permanent Facilities. Same as described in the No Action Alternative (Section 2.3).

Erosion Control. Surface disturbing activities would be prohibited in areas of highly erodible soils or soils that are difficult to reclaim.

Colorado River Salinity Control. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Wetlands and Floodplains. In addition to Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2), additional protection measures would be implemented to protect the ecological integrity of the dunal ponds and other ecologically important ephemeral wetlands not covered under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

Riparian Management Exclosures. In addition to Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2), existing riparian exclosures would be maintained, and new exclosures would be considered only if they benefit preservation of sensitive resources.

Fluid Mineral Wells. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Aquifer Recharge Areas. Similar to the No Action Alternative, aquifer recharge areas would be managed to maintain or enhance recharge volume and ground water quality by limiting road density and surface occupancy to maintain a healthy recharge area. In addition, studies would be conducted to better define aquifer recharge area boundaries.

2.5.2.4 Wild Horses Management

Wild Horse Herd Management Area Boundaries and Appropriate Management Levels. The Great Divide Basin HMA boundaries would be modified to exclude the JMH CAP planning area. The AML would be maintained at 415 to 600 horses.

Activity and Monitoring Plans. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Water Developments. Water developments would not be constructed for wild horse management.

Gathering Plan. A gathering plan would be developed and implemented to remove wild horses from the JMH CAP planning area.

Public Education. Opportunities for public education and enjoyment of wild horses would not be provided in the JMH CAP planning area.

2.5.2.5 Livestock Grazing Management

Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Rangeland and Riparian Habitat. In addition to Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2), grazing management systems (AMP) would assist in improving or maintaining the desired range condition. Approved AMPs, or other activity plans intended to serve as the functional equivalent to an AMP, for each of the designated grazing allotments would provide the necessary guidance for achieving grazing management objectives. Livestock grazing allotments that do not meet the standards would implement appropriate actions (as determined by an interdisciplinary team) if livestock grazing were found to be a factor in not meeting the standards. BLM staff would work with livestock operators to determine the most appropriate methods for achieving the standards. Modified turnout dates would be the primary methods for meeting the standards.

Forage Utilization Levels. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Livestock Water Developments and Range Improvements. Similar to the No Action Alternative, livestock water developments and range improvements would be considered to maintain or improve resource conditions and/or enhance livestock distribution. Compatibility with special status plant species would be required. Livestock water developments and range improvements proposed in sensitive wildlife habitat would be considered only if the habitat and resource conditions are improved.

Salt or Mineral Supplements. Salt or mineral supplements would not be allowed within ½ mile of riparian habitat, National Historic and Scenic Trails, areas inhabited by special status plant species, or other sensitive resource areas.

2.5.2.6 Vegetation Management

Special Status Plant Species. In addition to Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2), specific management actions related to known locations of special status species habitat include closing locations to surface disturbing activities or any disruptive activity that could adversely affect the plants or their habitat, as well as closing locations of special status species to the location of new mining claims; mineral material sales; OHV use, including vehicles used for geophysical exploration activities and surveying; and the use of explosives and blasting. Surface disturbing activities would be prohibited in special status plant species potential habitat areas.

Rights-of-Way Limitations. Actual plant locations and/or potential habitat of Wyoming BLM sensitive plant species would be right-of-way exclusion areas (Map 27). Exceptions to this exclusion would not be considered.

Fire Suppression. Fire suppression activities would also be limited within special status plant species habitat as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Threatened and Endangered Plant Species. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Invasive Species. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Forest and Woodland Health. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

2.5.2.7 Wildlife Habitat Management

Habitat Management Plan. A Habitat Management Plan would be prepared for the entire JMH CAP planning area under Alternative 2, instead of on an as-needed basis as described for the No Action Alternative. The habitat management plan would include habitat expansion efforts, threatened and endangered species reintroduction, and population goals and objectives.

Water Developments. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Special Status Wildlife Species. Same as described in the No Action Alternative (Section 2.3).

Sensitive Habitat. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Predator Damage Control. Proposed animal damage control activities not compatible with BLM planning and management prescriptions or objectives for other resource activities and users would be identified on a case-by-case basis. BLM would determine appropriate planning strategies, with input from APHIS-WS. The planning area would be designated a Restricted Control Area, which is a public land area where predator damage management may be planned, but control activities may be limited to certain methods or times of the year. Lethal animal damage control would be allowed only if it were a benefit to wildlife; nonlethal animal damage control would be allowed for livestock protection.

Greater Sage-Grouse Leks, Nesting, and Early Brood-Rearing Habitat. Greater sage-grouse concentration areas (leks and nesting habitat) would be NSO areas or closed to permanent structures and disruptive activities under this alternative. Disruptive activities would avoid these areas 24 hours a day during the strutting, nesting and brood-rearing periods. Nesting and early brood-rearing habitats would be protected from habitat degradation, and measures would be taken to improve habitat quality within greater sage-grouse concentration areas on an as-needed basis.

Greater Sage-Grouse Winter Range. Limitations on surface disturbing activities for this alternative include NSO and CSU requirements, and seasonal limitations (Map 28). The seasonal limitations for wildlife are shown in Table 2-3. Greater sage-grouse winter range would be NSO areas or closed to permanent structures and disruptive activities under this alternative.

All Greater Sage-Grouse Habitats (Leks, Nesting, Early Brood-Rearing, and Winter Range). Avoidance areas may vary depending on natural topographic barriers, terrain, vegetation structure and cover, type of activity, line of sight distance, habitat needs, etc.

Big Game Winter Range. The seasonal limitations for big game are shown in Table 2-3 and on Map 28. In addition to the No Action Alternative, vegetative character of big game (elk, deer, and antelope) crucial habitat would be restored on a case-by-case basis using BLM reclamation and monitoring practices (Appendix 9).

Big Game Birthing Areas. Big game birthing areas would be areas of NSO or closed to permanent structures and disruptive activities under this alternative (Map 28, Table 2-3). Vegetative character of big game birthing areas would be restored on a case-by-case basis using BLM reclamation and monitoring practices (Appendix 9).

Black-Footed Ferret. In addition to Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2), BLM would cooperate with USFWS and WGFD on any black-footed ferret reintroduction study within the planning area. Surveys for the black-footed ferret would be conducted according to USFWS current protocol. Measures would also be taken, as appropriate, to reduce potential raptor perches in and around prairie dog towns and colonies.

Mountain Plover. Mountain plover surveys would be conducted consistent with protocol described in the No Action Alternative, and additional actions would be taken to reduce impacts to the mountain plover, such as limiting traffic speeds and hunting perches. Active mountain plover nesting aggregation areas (Map 17) would be avoidance areas for surface disturbing and disruptive activities within ¼ mile of the area from April 10 to July 10.

Traffic speeds on BLM roads during the brood-rearing period (June and July) would be limited within ¼ mile of nesting concentration areas. Exceptions or other mitigation measures could be applied on a case-by-case basis, as determined by BLM in coordination with commodity users.

Measures (i.e., avoidance, burying power lines, installation of antiperch devices and exclusion for artificial nest structures) would be taken to limit hunting perches or nest sites for avian predators within ¼ mile of nesting concentration areas.

Game Fish and Special Status Fish Species. Same as described in the No Action Alternative (Section 2.3).

Raptor Nesting Sites. In addition to the No Action Alternative, raptor nesting sites would be NSO areas or closed to permanent structures and disruptive activities under this alternative (Map 28, Table 2-3). Permanent or high-profile structures would be prohibited within ½ to 1 mile of active raptor nests. Disruptive activity restrictions within the specified distance (usually a ½- to 1-mile radius) of occupied raptor nests would be applied year-round.

Introduction and Reintroduction of Species. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

2.5.3 Heritage Resources Management

Heritage Resources Protection. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Protection of Scientific Values. In addition to Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2), an appropriate level of inventory and analysis of all surface disturbing activities would be conducted to determine the potential effect of the activity on heritage resource, similar to the No Action Alternative. The Finley, Krmpotich, and Eden-Farson archaeological sites and the paleosol deposition area have been identified as important heritage resource sites. These sites would be managed to protect their scientific value. The Finley Site would be nominated to the NRHP under the Register's History of American Archaeology context and Earliest Americans context. The Krmpotich Site would be nominated under the Register's Earliest Americans context. The confidential locations of the Finley, Krmpotich, and Eden-Farson archaeological sites would be maintained, but interpretive information would be developed and made available at the RSFO.

The boundaries of the Greater Sand Dunes ACEC would be expanded to include the paleosol deposition area. The paleosol deposition area of the expanded ACEC would be evaluated and managed as an RNA. Surface disturbing activities would not be allowed other than for research purposes.

National Register Eligible Sites. All National Register-eligible historic sites would continue to be protected through provisions of the NHPA and would be nominated for inclusion in the NRHP. Sites eligible for inclusion in the NRHP under Criterion D would be surrounded by a 300-foot avoidance area. BLM would require development proponents to fund preparation of NRHP nominations on a case-by-case basis.

Native American Sites. In addition to Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2), the Indian Gap Trail would be researched and mapped, and an interpretive plan for the trail would be developed. Similar to the No Action Alternative, surface-disturbing and disruptive activities would be prohibited within a specified distance, but not less than 100 feet, of these and other Native American respected places. Native American tribal leaders would be consulted before authorization of activities that could disrupt or disturb respected places. Appropriate viewshed management areas associated with these sites would be determined through site- and activity-specific consultations with Native American representatives, SHPO, and the development proponent. Viewshed management goals would correspond with existing VRM classification. This may necessitate limiting, or mitigating the visibility of permanent

intrusions generally within a 270-degree radius from the identified respected place to the prominent landscape features.

The Indian Gap Trail would be researched and mapped and a trail interpretive plan would be developed.

Expansion Era Roads and Associated Sites. Expansion era roads and associated sites have been identified and would continue to be protected under provisions of the NHPA. Eligible sites would be nominated for listing in the NRHP. Surface disturbing activities would be limited within ¼ mile of nominated sites so as not to affect their eligibility status for the NRHP.

Historic Livestock Management Sites. Numerous livestock tending campsites and other minor pastoral agriculture-related sites have been identified throughout the JMH CAP planning area. Some of these sites may be eligible for inclusion in the NRHP within the context of the development of pastoral agriculture in Wyoming and the Rocky Mountain region and would continue to be protected under provisions of the NHPA. Surface disturbance would be limited within a minimum area of 300 feet at identified sites determined eligible for the NRHP.

Native and Euro-American Sites. Historic and archaeological sites within the context of early contact between Native Americans and Euro-American peoples have been identified and understood in general terms. Detailed historical context would be determined through consultation with Native American tribal leaders, and an interpretive program would be developed and implemented. The importance of these sites would continue to be recognized through nomination to the NRHP and/or inclusion in the Backcountry Byways program.

Paleontological Sites. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Unique Geologic Features. Management of Boars Tusk and the surrounding area would be the same as described in the No Action Alternative.

The Pinnacles Geographic Area (about 8,900 acres) would be an exclusion area for rights-of-way and a VRM Class I. The area within a ½ mile of the Pinnacles Geologic Feature, and including the features, would be closed to vehicular travel.

Tri-Territory Marker. Management would be the same as described in the No Action Alternative.

2.5.4 Travel, Access, and Realty Management

Transportation Planning. A transportation plan for the JMH CAP planning area would be developed in coordination with local governments and users. Transportation planning would provide for appropriate access routes to provide maximum protection for crucial habitats and sensitive resources. The transportation plan could include mitigation measures (such as offsite placement of facilities, remote control monitoring, restricted or prohibited surface use including road construction, multiple wells from a single pad, central tank batteries/facilities, pipelines and power lines concentrated in specific areas, based on site-specific analysis) in areas subject to seasonal limitations, CSU, and NSO stipulations. Transportation planning would include coordination with local governments, stakeholders and other publics.

Transportation planning would consider—

- Limiting points of access for all activities to minimize disruption.

- Closing and rehabilitating unused roads and trails and those causing resource damage. This would be subject to county review of existing right-of-way needs. The transportation plan and affected maps would be corrected to reflect closed roads and trails.
- Avoiding construction of stream or riparian area crossings in sensitive areas, and closure of unnecessary crossings. Exceptions may be granted if crossings would reduce adverse effects, benefit area objectives, and reduce miles of road and/or frequency of use. Bridges (versus culverts) would be required for perennial stream crossings.
- Limiting development zones to be accessed by designated routes.

Travel Management Plan. In conjunction with the overall transportation planning for JMH, travel management plans (Map 29) would be developed for the Steamboat Mountain, White Mountain, the two northern calving areas, and Essex Mountain to control access in these areas.

Road Installations. Proposed road installations and improvements would follow the Green River RMP management objectives and applicable BLM guidelines until a JMH transportation plan is prepared and approved. Exceptions to the plan would be evaluated only if beneficial to natural and cultural resource values. Proposed roads and improvements for Steamboat Mountain and White Mountain would follow the guidelines specified in Appendix 12.

Geophysical Activities. Geophysical activities would be required to conform to the OHV use designations of the Green River RMP for those portions of the planning area outside of areas with NSO requirements, WSAs, ACECs, and other sensitive resource areas.

Geophysical and related detonation activities would be excluded from areas with NSO requirements, WSAs, ACECs, and other sensitive resource areas. Seasonal limitations would apply.

Rights-of-Way. Areas would be designated as right-of-way avoidance or exclusion areas based on the location of specific sensitive resources (Map 27).

Linear Rights-of-Way. Utility and transportation corridors to accommodate major linear rights-of-way needs would be established to coincide with existing roads, trails, and right-of-way easements that do not create a safety hazard or conflict with other resource objectives.

Winter Access. Winter access would be limited to specific roads identified for winter use. Where winter access on roads other than those identified for winter access in the transportation plan is necessary, routes would be determined on a case-by-case basis. Plowing of roads would be allowed for emergencies only.

OHV Management. Public lands in the JMH CAP planning area would remain open, limited, or closed (Map 30). The OHV management prescriptions would limit access to designated roads and trails and implement seasonal closures in big game crucial habitat. WSAs and specific sensitive resource areas would be closed, but the Greater Sand Dunes Recreation Area would remain open. Exceptions to OHV use may be granted in closed areas for scientific purposes or emergency access needs.

Over-the-Snow Vehicles. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Land Withdrawals and Exchanges. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Ownership Adjustments. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Access. Access to public, state, and private land would be provided throughout the planning area and would be restricted only where necessary to protect public health and safety and to protect sensitive resources. Access would be guaranteed across public lands to landlocked private and state lands consistent with the guidelines and objectives set down in FLPMA. In addition to the No Action Alternative, access would be additionally restricted using a variety of strategies and measures.

2.5.5 Recreation Resources Management

Management of recreation resources would allow for passive and active use of the planning area while maximizing the protection of environmental resources and the health and safety of users. Emphasis would be placed on the primitive experience for visitors, with less disruption of resources and more restrictions within the planning area through limiting OHV use.

Backcountry Byways. More visitor information and interpretive services would be provided to enhance the visitor experience. Recreation project plans would be developed for the Backcountry Byways program (Tri-Territory Loop and Red Desert) and would include interpretive and directional signs. The location of these signs would be coordinated with state and local governments and other interested parties for the Red Desert view point from the dugway of Steamboat Mountain, Chicken Springs overlook, Steamboat Mountain, Oregon Buttes, Honeycomb Buttes, and Indian Gap.

Greater Sand Dunes Recreation Area. The parking area and camping facilities at the Greater Sand Dunes Recreation Area would be maintained in their current condition. To avoid conflicts with fluid minerals development on existing leases and to protect the health and safety of users, the recreation area would not be expanded or improved to accommodate additional users, similar to Alternative 1.

Recreation Project Plans. Recreation project plans and interpretive prospectuses would be prepared similar to Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2), except that plans and prospectuses would also be prepared for Native American sites, including Indian Gap.

Camping. Specific areas would be designated for camping use to protect certain resources, such as sensitive plant species, riparian areas, greater sage-grouse leks, mountain plover aggregation areas, and big game birthing areas. To monitor resource use and impact and to minimize disturbance during sensitive seasonal periods, parties of five or more would require a group camping permit and would stay within designated group camping areas.

Special Recreation Use Permits. Special recreation use permits for managed activities that would occur in the JMH CAP planning area would be issued and renewed, and fees would be collected through the RSFO. This would allow the RSFO to track the amount, location, and timing of organized activity occurring within the planning area to monitor resource pressure. Permit fees would be available for program development. The permit evaluation process would consider the nature of the event, potential impacts to resources, conflicts with other events, and impacts to the quality of other visitors' experiences. Mitigation measures necessary to protect the resources would be included in any permit issued. A Plan of Operation would be required for all commercial recreational operators and outfitters. The plan would describe the type, extent, and location of the recreation use and the mechanisms by which the operator/outfitter would prevent impacts to environmental resources. Any requests in special recreation use permit applications to remove natural resources would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis after an environmental analysis process.

Recreational Mining and Other Similar Activity. The planning area would be withdrawn from all mineral location and mining claims. Recreational mining and other similar activity would be prohibited in the planning area.

Continental Peak/South Pass Connecting Side Trail. The Continental Peak/South Pass Connecting Side Trail would be managed as a side trail to the existing Continental Divide National Scenic Trail (CDNST). Management would be as described for the CDNST (BLM 1999). Existing primitive two-track roads, BLM roads that provide legal public access through certain private lands, segments of cross-country travel on BLM-administered public land, and an existing trail would be used as components of the CDNST. The existing primitive two-track roads and BLM road segments would continue to be open to motorized use. Cross-country travel routes would not be open to motorized use.

2.5.6 Minerals and Alternative Energy Resources Management

This alternative would close sensitive resource areas to new leasing and development. Consideration would be given to allowing extraction of viable resources on leases held by production until economic reserves are recovered. Development could be allowed in other areas.

2.5.6.1 Leasable Fluid Minerals Management

Oil and Gas Leases. In addition to Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2), suspended leases in the planning area would be reinstated and APDs considered consistent with existing lease stipulations. New leases would be offered only in nonsensitive resource areas. Sensitive resource areas, which include the core area, would be closed to subsequent lease offerings (Map 31).

Purchase or exchange of existing leases would be negotiated with willing leaseholders in areas that would be closed to leasing for protection of sensitive resources. Areas that would be closed to leasing include the core area, connectivity area, crucial wildlife habitat, and other sensitive resources. Funding would be pursued to buy out and exchange leases in sensitive resource areas where leaseholders would be willing to be compensated for their valid existing rights. Where existing leases in sensitive resource areas could not be exchanged, development of existing leases could continue. Upon expiration, previously leased parts of sensitive resource areas would not be offered for lease in subsequent sales. For exchanged or purchased leases, leaseholders would complete required reclamation of existing surface structures, pipelines, and oil and gas service roads to return sensitive areas to their predevelopment state, to the degree practicable.

Lease Stipulations. The lease stipulations notify the leaseholder that development activities may be limited, prohibited, or implemented, with mitigation measures to protect specific resources (Table 2-2).

Drilling Permits. Similar to the No Action Alternative, the APDs for new wells would be issued in compliance with existing lease stipulations for resource protection and 43 CFR 3100 regulations (Appendix 14). Mitigation requirements, such as seasonal restrictions on drilling, may be required as a result of a site-specific analysis. Stipulations on existing leases could be excepted where site-specific analyses do not identify the presence of the resource of concern addressed by the stipulation (Appendix 4). For existing leases with current standard stipulations, exceptions would be allowed when site-specific analyses show that no unacceptable impacts to sensitive resources would occur. In addition, refer to Section 2.5.4 for additional mitigation measures that may apply as part of the transportation plan.

2.5.6.2 Leasable Solid Minerals Management

Exploration. The planning area would be closed to coal and sodium exploration (Map 32).

Leasing. Federal coal lands within the Coal Occurrence and Development Potential Area would be closed for coal leasing and development under the Federal Coal Management Program to protect other resource values in the planning area (Map 33). Because there are no existing coal leases in the JMH, there are no valid existing rights that would have to be recognized in closing the area.

2.5.6.3 Locatable Minerals Management

Locatable Mineral Withdrawals. The planning area would be withdrawn from filing of mineral claims and exploration and development activities, including recreational use mining activity, to protect other resource values (Map 34). Existing claims would be reviewed for validity and economic feasibility, and those found to be valid could be developed. Development on valid existing claims would be allowed consistent with regulations in 43 CFR 3809, and mining activity would be required to comply with other applicable regulations, including limitations on air and water discharges, waste management, spill prevention, and endangered species.

2.5.6.4 Salable Minerals Management

Mineral Material Sales. The planning area would be closed to mineral material sales to protect other resources (Map 35). Extraction of salable minerals would be allowed as required to meet other planning objectives, such as maintenance of existing roads in the approved transportation plan. Mining and reclamation plans would be required for each use of salable mineral materials.

2.5.6.5 Alternative Energy Management

Alternative Energy Proposals. The planning area would be closed to alternative energy development projects to ensure protection of other resource values. Realty actions such as permits or leases for alternative energy proposals would not be approved.

2.5.7 Visual Resources Management

The planning area would be managed to maintain or improve scenic quality by managing the impacts of human activities and other intrusions on the visual landscape (Map 36). The VRM classes provide the design standards for all surface disturbing projects. Projects would be designed, sited, screened, or painted to reduce visual impacts regardless of the VRM classification.

VRM Class I Areas. In addition to Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2), all ACECs (which includes expansion areas), Indian Gap, unique geologic features, and landforms including Boars Tusk (plus a 1-mile buffer), Pinnacles Geographic Area, Freighter Gap, portions of White Mountain, and the portion of the Red Desert Watershed within the planning area would be managed as VRM Class I areas.

VRM Class II Areas. Management actions on lands classified as VRM Class II would be designed for blending into the natural landscape. A low level of change would be acceptable to the characteristic landscapes of Split Rock. All sensitive habitat areas, riparian zones, water sources, floodplains, and recreation areas would also be managed as VRM Class II. The Continental Peak/South Pass Connecting Side Trail would also be managed as VRM Class II areas. Surface disturbing activities could be seen in these areas but would not attract the attention of the casual observer.

VRM Class III Areas. Management actions on lands classified as VRM Class III would be designed to partially retain the existing character of the landscape and would allow a moderate level of change. The remainder of the planning area not managed as VRM Class I or II would be managed as Class III.

Surface disturbing activities could attract attention but would not dominate the view of the casual observer.

VRM Class IV Areas. There would be no lands within the planning area classified as VRM Class IV.

2.5.8 Management of Special Management Areas and Other Management Areas

Special management areas would continue to be managed to preserve and protect the integrity and character of the specific areas in accordance with ACEC policies and WSA interim management policies. Other resources and locations throughout the planning area that would be worthy of special protections would be designated as special management areas (Map 37).

2.5.8.1 Special Management Areas

2.5.8.1.1 Wilderness Study Areas

Geophysical Activities. Geophysical exploration and related detonation activities would be prohibited.

Rights-of-Way. These areas would be managed as right-of-way exclusion areas.

Locatable Minerals. Withdrawals from mineral location would be pursued in these areas.

2.5.8.1.2 Oregon Buttes ACEC

Geophysical Activities. Geophysical activities and related detonation activities would be prohibited in the ACEC.

Rights-of-Way. The ACEC would be managed as a right-of-way exclusion area.

Recreation. Location of interpretive and directional signs along backcountry byways would be coordinated with state and local governments and other interested parties for Oregon Buttes.

A recreation project plan and interpretive prospectus would be prepared and implemented for Oregon Buttes.

Locatable Minerals. Withdrawals from mineral location would be pursued in the ACEC as well as the entire planning area.

2.5.8.1.3 South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC

Rights-of-Way. The South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC (visible portion) would be managed as a right-of-way exclusion area. South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC (nonvisible portion) would be managed as a right-of-way avoidance area.

OHV Use. OHV use within the South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC (visible portion) would be limited to designated roads and trails. OHV use within the nonvisible portion would be limited to existing roads and trails.

Leasable Fluid Minerals. The entire South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC would be closed to fluid minerals leasing.

Leasable Solid Minerals. The entire South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC would be closed to leasable solid minerals exploration and leasing.

Locatable Minerals. Withdrawals from mineral location would be pursued in the entire South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC.

VRM. The ACEC would be managed as a VRM Class I area.

The South Pass Historic Landscape viewshed would be expanded to approximately 5 miles of the Oregon, Mormon, California, and Pony Express trail routes. Intrusions within the viewshed area could be allowed provided the results of a visual analysis indicate they are not visible from the trail routes or that they can be mitigated.

2.5.8.1.4 White Mountain Petroglyphs ACEC

Recreation. A recreation plan and interpretive prospectus would be prepared and implemented.

Leasable Fluid Minerals. The ACEC would be closed to fluid minerals leasing.

Leasable Solid Minerals. White Mountain Petroglyphs vista would be closed to coal and sodium exploration.

VRM. The ACEC would be would be managed as a VRM Class I area.

2.5.8.1.5 Steamboat Mountain ACEC

Steamboat Mountain ACEC would be expanded to include the area of highest concentration and overlap of big game habitat features, natural systems, and cultural values. These include the largest portion of elk crucial winter range and birthing area overlap, a portion of the sand dunes stabilized by the basin big sagebrush/lemon scurfpea plant community, and the Native American respected places of Indian Gap and portions of the Indian Gap Trail (Map 37).

The basin big sagebrush/lemon scurfpea vegetation community would be further evaluated as a research natural area and designated as if the criteria are met (Map 37).

Rights-of-Way. The ACEC would be managed as a right-of-way exclusion area.

Communication Sites. Communication sites would be prohibited in Steamboat Mountain ACEC.

OHV Use. OHV use would be limited to existing roads and trails.

Recreation. Location of interpretive and directional signs along backcountry byways would be coordinated with state and local governments and other interested parties for Steamboat Mountain.

A recreation plan and interpretive prospectus would be prepared and implemented for Steamboat Mountain.

Leasable Fluid Minerals. The ACEC would be closed to fluid minerals leasing consideration.

Leasable Solid Minerals. The ACEC would be closed to leasable solid minerals exploration and leasing.

Salable Minerals. The ACEC would be closed to mineral material sales.

Locatable Minerals. Withdrawals from mineral location would be pursued in the ACEC.

VRM. The ACEC would be managed as a VRM Class I area.

2.5.8.1.6 Greater Sand Dunes ACEC

The Greater Sand Dunes ACEC would be expanded to include the paleosol deposition area (Map 37). The expansion area would be managed as a research natural area (RNA).

The portion of the ACEC within the WSA containing the dunal ponds (flockets) would be further evaluated as a research natural area and designated as such if the criteria are met (Map 37).

Rights-of-Way. The ACEC would be managed as a right-of-way avoidance area (within 1 mile or the visual horizon, whichever is closer). The expansion area of ACEC (paleosol deposition area) would be managed as a right of way exclusion area.

OHV Use. The portion of the ACEC containing the Greater Sand Dunes Recreation Area would be open to OHV use. The remainder of the ACEC would be limited to designated roads and trails.

Leasable Fluid Minerals. The ACEC would be closed to fluid mineral leasing.

Leasable Solid Minerals. The ACEC would be closed to leasable solid minerals exploration and leasing.

Locatable Minerals. Withdrawals from mineral location would be pursued in the ACEC.

VRM. The ACEC would be managed as a VRM Class I area.

2.5.8.1.7 Special Status Plant Species ACEC

The Special Status Plant Species ACEC would be expanded into the JMH CAP area where such species are located (Map 37).

The Special Status Plant Species ACEC would be expanded into the JMH CAP area where potential habitat for such species is located (Map 37).

Rights-of-Way. The ACEC would be managed as a right-of-way exclusion area.

OHV Use. The ACEC would be closed to OHV use.

Leasable Minerals. The ACEC would be closed to all mineral leasing.

Leasable Solid Minerals. The ACEC would be closed to coal and sodium exploration.

Salable Minerals. The ACEC would be closed to mineral material sales.

Rangeland Management. Salt or mineral supplements would not be allowed within ½ mile of areas where special status plant species occur.

Vegetation treatments would be designed to protect and conform to special status plant species.

2.5.8.1.8 Cushion Plant Community ACEC

Cushion plant communities would be designated an ACEC (Map 37).

The Cushion Plant Community ACEC would be further evaluated for designation as an RNA and designated as such if the criteria are met.

Rights-of-Way. The ACEC would be managed as an exclusion area for rights-of-way or other surface disturbing activities.

Leasable Solid Minerals. The ACEC would be closed to leasable solid minerals exploration and leasing.

Salable Minerals. The ACEC would be closed to mineral material sales.

Locatable Minerals. Withdrawals from mineral location would be pursued in the ACEC.

2.5.8.2 Other Management Areas

2.5.8.2.1 Pinnacles Geologic Feature

The Pinnacles Geologic Feature would be designated an ACEC.

Rights-of-Way. The area would be managed as a right-of-way exclusion area.

OHV Use. The area would be closed to OHV use.

Leasable Fluid Minerals. The area would be closed to fluid minerals leasing.

Leasable Solid Minerals. The area would be closed to leasable solid minerals exploration.

Salable Minerals. The area would be closed to mineral material sales.

Locatable Minerals. Withdrawals from mineral location would be pursued.

VRM. The area would be managed as a VRM Class I area.

2.5.8.2.2 Pinnacles Geographic Area

Rights-of-Way. The area would be managed as a right-of-way exclusion area.

OHV Use. The area would be closed to OHV use.

Leasable Fluid Minerals. The area would be closed to fluid minerals leasing.

Leasable Solid Minerals. The area would be closed to leasable solid minerals exploration and leasing.

Salable Minerals. The area would be closed to mineral material sales.

Locatable Minerals. Withdrawals from mineral location would be pursued.

VRM. The area would be managed as a VRM Class I.

2.5.8.2.3 Red Desert Watershed Management Area

Leasable Fluid Minerals. The area would be closed to fluid minerals leasing.

VRM. The area would be managed as a VRM Class I area.

2.6 ALTERNATIVE 3

Alternative 3 provides opportunities to use and develop the planning area while ensuring resource protection. The alternative would allow development and activities to occur throughout the planning area provided sensitive resources are protected and mitigation requirements are met. Mitigation requirements necessary to ensure the stability of the sensitive resource indicators would be determined through an adaptive management approach to resource use and protection.

2.6.1 Management Actions Common to All Resource or Land Use Programs

Monitoring Plan. An interdisciplinary monitoring plan would be developed to evaluate the overall effectiveness of implementing the management decisions for the planning area. Site-specific monitoring plans would be developed for project proposals.

Resource indicators, developed as part of an interdisciplinary monitoring plan, would be used for determining the effects of all activities on sensitive resources, with emphasis on wildlife and wildlife habitat. Consideration would be given to such factors as weather, disease, drought, hunting pressure, introduction of nonnative species, and recreation activities. Monitoring data would be assessed and response actions would be determined by an interdisciplinary BLM team with input from stakeholders and other publics. Timing and sequencing for approving all actions and use authorizations would be imposed if indicators show unacceptable effects on sensitive resources.

2.6.2 Land and Water Resources Management

2.6.2.1 General Management Actions for Land and Water Resources

Healthy Rangelands. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Proper Functioning Condition. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Desired Plant Community. In addition to Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2), DPC objectives for upland and riparian areas would be established for the planning area through individual site-specific activity and implementation planning, and as updated ecological site inventory data becomes available. DPC objectives would emphasize wildlife habitat, livestock grazing, watershed, and biodiversity values while maintaining or enhancing habitat for special status species.

Vegetation Treatments. Similar to the No Action Alternative, vegetation treatments would be designed on a case-by-case basis. Such activities may include seeding, reseeding, fence construction, weed control, water development, and enhancement of fish and wildlife habitat. Vegetation treatments would be used to abate, alter, or transform vegetation communities in an effort to achieve DPC objectives, protect water quality, dissipate erosion, and conform to requirements to protect special status plant species and associated habitats (Appendix 6). This may include activities such as manual or mechanical manipulation, chemical treatments, and prescribed burns (Appendix 8). Prescribed burns would be the

preferred method of vegetation manipulation to convert stands of brush to grasslands and to promote regeneration of aspen stands and/or shrub species. Low-intensity burns during periods of high soil moisture would be the preferred method/times in mountain shrub communities. Prescribed burns would be restricted in areas with surface coal or other fossil fuel outcrops. All vegetation treatments would be irregular in shape for edge effect, cover, and visual aesthetics.

Areas proposed for treatment with prescribed burns would be rested 1 full year prior to treatment (unless vegetation cover prior to burning has adequate fine fuels to carry the fire) and 24 months after treatment. Treatments in aspen communities would be fenced on a case-by-case basis.

Fences. Fences on public lands would be removed, modified, or reconstructed where documented wildlife conflicts with fencing occur. Herding control of livestock would be encouraged as an alternative to fencing. Similar to the No Action Alternative, fence construction would be in accordance with BLM design standards and located so as not to overly impede wildlife or wild horse movement.

Watershed Health Assessments. Same as described for Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Native Vegetation. Same as described in the No Action Alternative (Section 2.3).

2.6.2.2 Fire Management

Fire Management Implementation Plan. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Fire Suppression. Similar to the No Action Alternative, full fire suppression for basin big sagebrush/lemon scurfpea vegetation associations would be applied.

2.6.2.3 Water Resources Management

Water Quality. In addition to Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2), the area within 500 feet to ¼ mile of wetlands, riparian areas, and 100-year floodplains would be avoidance areas for surface disturbing activities. The appropriate distance would be determined on a case-by-case basis. Surface disturbing activities could be permitted within avoidance areas, provided that a mitigation plan is approved and a site-specific analysis determines that adverse impacts would not occur as a result of the activity, similar to the No Action Alternative.

Permanent Facilities. Permanent facilities, such as storage tanks and structure pits, would not be allowed in 100-year floodplains, wetlands, and riparian areas, but structures that would enhance the protection and management of these areas would be considered. Proposals for linear crossings in these areas would be considered on a case-by-case basis.

Erosion Control. Same as described for the No Action Alternative (Section 2.3).

Colorado River Salinity Control. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Wetlands and Floodplains. Wetlands and floodplains would be managed in accordance with Executive Orders 11988 and 11990 and section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Specific actions would be implemented to protect the ecological integrity of the dunal ponds and other ecologically important ephemeral wetlands not covered under section 404 of the Clean Water Act, similar to Alternative 2.

Riparian Management Exclosures. Same as described in the No Action Alternative (Section 2.3).

Fluid Mineral Wells. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Aquifer Recharge Areas. Aquifer recharge areas would be managed to maintain or enhance recharge volume and ground water quality by limiting road density and surface occupancy to maintain a healthy recharge area. Studies would be conducted in relation to specific projects on a case-by-case basis to better define aquifer recharge area boundaries.

2.6.2.4 Wild Horses Management

Wild Horse Herd Management Area Boundaries and Appropriate Management Levels. The Great Divide Basin HMA would be expanded to include the entire JMH CAP planning area (Map 38). The appropriate management level would be maintained at 415 to 600 horses, but no more than 100 horses of the AML would be allowed in the expansion area.

Activity and Monitoring Plans. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Water Developments. Water developments would be provided as needed to improve wild horse herd distribution and manage forage utilization. Water developments within sensitive wildlife habitats would be considered only if wildlife habitat and resource conditions are improved or maintained.

Gathering Plan. Same as described in the No Action Alternative (Section 2.3).

Public Education. Same as described in the No Action Alternative (Section 2.3).

2.6.2.5 Livestock Grazing Management

Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Rangeland and Riparian Habitat. Same as described in the No Action Alternative (Section 2.3).

Forage Utilization Levels. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Livestock Water Developments and Range Improvements. Similar to the No Action Alternative, livestock water developments and range improvements would be considered to maintain or improve resource conditions and/or enhance livestock distribution. Compatibility with special status plant species would be required. Water developments or range improvements proposed in sensitive wildlife habitat would be considered only if wildlife habitat and resource conditions are maintained or improved.

Salt or Mineral Supplements. Salt or mineral supplements would not be allowed within ¼ mile of riparian habitat, National Historic and Scenic Trails, areas inhabited by special status plant species, or other sensitive resource areas, unless analysis shows that watershed, riparian, and wildlife values, or the integrity of trails, would not be adversely affected.

2.6.2.6 Vegetation Management

Special Status Plant Species. Similar to the No Action Alternative, specific management actions related to known locations of special status species habitat include closing locations to surface disturbing activities or any disruptive activity that could adversely affect the plants or their habitat; location of new mining claims; mineral material sales; OHV use, including those vehicles used for geophysical exploration activities and surveying; and use of explosives and blasting. Surface disturbing activities also would be prohibited in special status plant species potential habitat areas.

Rights-of-Way Limitations. Actual plant locations and/or potential habitat of Wyoming BLM sensitive plant species would be right-of-way exclusion areas. Exceptions could be considered on a case-by-case basis.

Fire Suppression. Fire suppression activities would also be limited within special status plant species habitat.

Threatened and Endangered Plant Species. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Invasive Species. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Forest and Woodland Health. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

2.6.2.7 Wildlife Habitat Management

Habitat Management Plan. Same as described in the No Action Alternative (Section 2.3).

Water Developments. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Special Status Wildlife Species. Same as described in the No Action Alternative (Section 2.3).

Sensitive Habitat. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Predator Damage Control. The planning area would be designated a Restricted Control Area, as described in Alternative 2. Lethal animal damage control would be allowed in animal damage control for both livestock and wildlife; however, nonlethal controls would be emphasized.

Greater Sage-Grouse Leks, Nesting, and Early Brood-Rearing Habitat. NSO limitations would apply only to greater sage-grouse leks (with a ½-mile buffer). Disruptive activities would avoid occupied greater sage-grouse leks and within ½ mile of nesting and brood-rearing areas from sunset to 9:00 a.m. daily. Disruptive activities would avoid occupied greater sage-grouse leks from usually March 15 to May 15. The actual area to be avoided, usually within ¼ to ½ mile of the lek, and appropriate seasonal limitations would be determined on a case-by-case basis. Seasonal limitations on surface disturbing and disruptive activities (usually from March 15 to July 15) would apply within actual nesting and early brood-rearing habitat up to 2 miles from greater sage-grouse leks on a case-by-case basis (Map 39). Nesting and early brood-rearing habitats would be protected from habitat degradation, and measures would be taken to improve habitat quality within 2 miles from greater sage-grouse leks (Map 39) on an as-needed basis.

Greater Sage-Grouse Winter Range. Disruptive activities would be prohibited in greater sage-grouse winter range (Map 39) usually from November 15 to March 15. These areas are subject to change based on new data and scientific information.

All Greater Sage-Grouse Habitats (Leks, Nesting, Early Brood-Rearing, and Winter Range). Same as described in the No Action Alternative (Section 2.3).

Maintenance and Operational Activities in Greater Sage-Grouse Habitats. In greater sage-grouse habitats, surface disturbing maintenance and operational activities would require mitigation measures or development plans. These mitigation measures or development plans would be based on local situations on a case-by-case basis.

Big Game Winter Range. Same as described in the No Action Alternative (Section 2.3).

Big Game Birthing Areas. Same as described in the No Action Alternative (Section 2.3).

Black-Footed Ferret. In addition to the management described in the No Action Alternative, measures would be taken, as appropriate, to reduce potential raptor perches in and around prairie dog towns and colonies, as described in Alternative 1.

Mountain Plover. The mountain plover would be managed as described in Alternative 2.

Game Fish and Special Status Fish Species. Game fish and special status fish species would be managed as described in the No Action Alternative.

Raptor Nesting Sites. Raptor nesting sites would be managed as described in the No Action Alternative.

Introduction and Reintroduction of Species. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

2.6.3 Heritage Resources Management

Heritage Resources Protection. In addition to Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2), an appropriate level of inventory and analysis of all surface disturbing activities would be conducted to determine the potential effect of the activity on heritage resources, similar to the No Action Alternative.

Protection of Scientific Values. In addition to Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2), the Finley, Krmpotich, and Eden-Farson archaeological sites, and the paleosol deposition area, have been identified as important heritage resource sites. These sites would be managed to protect their scientific value. The confidential locations of the Finley, Krmpotich, and Eden-Farson archaeological sites would be maintained, but interpretive information would be developed and made available at the RSFO. The boundaries of the Greater Sand Dunes ACEC would be expanded to include the paleosol deposition area. Surface disturbing activities proposed in the paleosol deposition area would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis after an archaeological inventory of the area. The heritage resource inventory would include subsurface testing by remote sensing techniques, hand-dug test excavations, mechanical testing, or other appropriate methods approved by BLM in consultation with SHPO. Mitigation may include research-oriented data recovery excavation conducted pursuant to a Data Recovery Plan approved by BLM in consultation with SHPO.

National Register Eligible Sites. All National Register-eligible historic sites would continue to be protected through provisions of the NHPA, and several high-profile sites would be nominated for inclusion in the NRHP. Project proponents would be required to fund the preparation of National Register nominations. Sites eligible for inclusion in the NRHP under Criterion D would be surrounded by a 100-foot avoidance area.

Native American Sites. Areas located in Steamboat Mountain, Steamboat Rim, White Mountain Rim, Essex Mountain, Monument Ridge, Joe Hay Rim, and the Indian Gap Trail have been identified as respected places by tribal representatives. These locations may include sacred sites or traditional cultural properties and may be eligible for inclusion in the NRHP. Native American tribal leaders would be consulted prior to authorization of activities that could disrupt or disturb respected places. Surface disturbance and disruptive activities would be prohibited within a specific distance, but not less than 100 feet, of these and other Native American respected places, similar to the No Action Alternative. Appropriate viewshed management areas associated with these sites would be determined through site- and activity-specific consultations with Native American representatives, SHPO, and the development proponent. Viewshed management goals would correspond with existing VRM classification. This may necessitate limiting, or mitigating the visibility of permanent intrusions generally within a 270-degree radius from the identified respected place to the prominent landscape features.

Information would be gathered on the Indian Gap Trail, the trail would be mapped, and an interpretive plan developed.

Expansion Era Roads and Associated Sites. Expansion era roads and associated sites have been identified and would continue to be protected under provisions of the NHPA. The portion of the roads and sites that contribute to their NRHP eligibility would be nominated for listing in the NRHP. Surface disturbing activities would be limited within ¼ mile of eligible trail segments or sites.

Historic Livestock Management Sites. Numerous livestock tending campsites and other pastoral agricultural sites have been identified throughout the JMH CAP planning area. Some of these locations may be eligible for inclusion in the NRHP within the context of the development of pastoral agriculture in Wyoming and the Rocky Mountain region. These sites would continue to be protected under provisions of the NHPA. Surface disturbance would be limited within a minimum area of 100 feet at identified sites determined eligible for the NRHP.

Native and Euro-American Sites. Historic and archaeological sites within the context of early contact between Native Americans and Euro-American peoples have been identified, but they are understood only in general terms. The historical context of these sites would continue to be developed, and an interpretive program would be developed and implemented to improve public appreciation of these locations. Sites may be nominated to the NRHP and/or included in the Backcountry Byways program on a case-by-case basis.

Paleontological Sites. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Unique Geologic Features. Management of Boars Tusk and the surrounding area would be the same as described in the No Action Alternative.

The Pinnacles Geographic Area (about 8,900 acres) would be an exclusion area for rights-of-way and a VRM Class I. The area within a ½ mile of the Pinnacles Geologic Feature, and including the features, would be closed to vehicular travel.

Tri-Territory Marker. Management would be the same as described in the No Action Alternative.

2.6.4 Travel, Access, and Realty Management

Travel management, access limitations, and realty actions would be developed if protection from unacceptable impacts to sensitive resource areas were possible.

Transportation Planning. Transportation planning would provide for appropriate access routes to provide maximum protection for crucial habitats and sensitive resources. A transportation plan specific to the JMH CAP planning area would be developed in coordination with local governments and users. The transportation plan could include mitigation measures (such as offsite placement of facilities, remote control monitoring, restricted or prohibited surface use including road construction, multiple wells from a single pad, central tank batteries/facilities, pipelines and power lines concentrated in specific areas, based on site-specific analysis) in areas subject to seasonal limitations and CSU and NSO stipulations. Transportation planning would include coordination with local governments, stakeholders and other publics.

Transportation planning would consider—

- Access restrictions, such as seasonal road closures and/or gating, to limit frequency of access in crucial wildlife habitat.
- Rerouting or rehabilitating existing roads and trails causing resource damage. This would be subject to county review of existing rights-of-way needs.
- Concentrating stream and riparian area crossings in key locations to avoid disruptions. Exceptions may be granted if crossings would reduce adverse effects, benefit area objectives, and reduce miles of road (and/or frequency of use). Bridges may be required on Pacific, Jack Morrow, Parnell, and Rock Cabin creeks.
- Posting speed limits as necessary to protect wildlife and public health and safety and to meet area objectives.

Travel Management Plan. In conjunction with the overall transportation planning for JMH, a travel management plan (Map 29) would be developed for the Steamboat Mountain, White Mountain, the two northern calving areas, and Essex Mountain to control access in these areas.

Road Installations. Proposed road installations and improvements would follow the Green River RMP management objectives and applicable BLM guidelines until a JMH Transportation Plan is prepared and approved. Exceptions to the plan would address site-specific conditions so as to minimize impacts on natural and cultural resource values. Similar to Alternative 2, proposed roads and improvements for Steamboat Mountain and White Mountain would follow the guidelines specified in Appendix 12.

Geophysical Activities. Geophysical vehicular activities, including detonation activities, would be excluded from areas with NSO requirements, WSAs, ACECs, and other sensitive resource areas. Seasonal limitations would apply. Exceptions would be granted provided adequate mitigation measures could be implemented.

Rights-of-Way. Areas would be designated as right-of-way avoidance or exclusion areas based on the location of specific sensitive resources. Areas closed to surface occupancy and mineral leasing would be right-of-way exclusion areas (Map 40).

Linear Rights-of-Way. Similar to Alternative 2, utility and transportation corridors to accommodate major linear right-of-way needs would be established to coincide with existing roads, trails, and right-of-way easements.

Winter Access. Winter access would be limited to specific roads identified for winter use. Where winter access on roads other than those identified for winter access in the transportation plan is necessary, routes would be determined on a case-by-case basis in accordance with transportation planning requirements. Plowing would be allowed as needed.

OHV Management. Public lands in the JMH CAP planning area would remain open, limited, or closed (Map 41). The OHV management prescriptions would limit access to designated roads and trails in sensitive resource areas. Seasonal closures would be implemented in sensitive habitat areas. WSAs and specific sensitive resource areas would be closed, but the Greater Sand Dunes Recreation Area would remain open. Exceptions to OHV use may be granted in closed areas for scientific purposes or for emergency access needs.

Over-the-Snow Vehicles. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Land Withdrawals and Exchanges. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Ownership Adjustments. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

Access. Similar to the No Action Alternative, access to public, state, and private land would be provided throughout the planning area and would be restricted only where necessary to protect public health and safety and to protect sensitive resources. Access would be guaranteed across public lands to landlocked private and state lands consistent with the guidelines and objectives set down in FLPMA.

2.6.5 Recreation Resources Management

Management of recreation resources would allow for passive and active use of the planning area while maximizing the protection of environmental resources and the health and safety of users, similar to Alternative 2. Emphasis would be placed on the primitive experience for visitors, with less disruption of resources and more restrictions within the planning area, including OHV use.

Backcountry Byways. More visitor information and interpretive services would be provided to enhance the visitor experience, similar to Alternative 2. Recreation project plans would be developed for the Backcountry Byways program (Tri-Territory Loop and Red Desert) and would include interpretive and directional signs. The location of these signs would be coordinated with state and local governments and other interested parties for the Red Desert view point from dugway of Steamboat Mountain, Chicken Springs overlook, Steamboat Mountain, Oregon Buttes, Honeycomb Buttes, and Indian Gap.

Greater Sand Dunes Recreation Area. The parking area and camping facilities at the Greater Sand Dunes Recreation Area would be maintained in their current condition. To avoid conflicts with fluid minerals development on existing leases and to protect the health and safety of users, the recreation area would not be expanded or improved to accommodate additional users, similar to Alternative 1.

Recreation Project Plans. Recreation project plans and interpretive prospectuses would be prepared similar to Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2), except that plans and prospectuses would also be prepared for Native American sites, including Indian Gap.

Camping. Similar to Alternative 2, specific areas would be designated for camping use to protect certain resources, such as sensitive plant species, riparian areas, greater sage-grouse leks, mountain plover aggregation areas, and big game birthing areas. To monitor resource use and impact and to minimize disturbance during sensitive seasonal periods, parties of 10 or more would require a group camping permit and would stay within designated group camping areas.

Special Recreation Use Permits. Similar to Alternative 2, special recreation use permits for managed activities that would occur in the JMH CAP planning area would be issued and renewed through the RSFO. This would allow the RSFO to track the amount, location, and timing of organized activity occurring within the planning area to monitor resource pressure. Similar to the No Action Alternative, the permit evaluation process would consider the nature of the event, potential impacts to resources, conflicts with other events, and impacts to the quality of other visitors' experiences. Mitigation measures necessary to protect the resources would be included in any permit issued. A plan of operation would be required for all commercial recreational operators and outfitters. The plan would describe the type, extent, and location of the recreation use and the mechanisms by which the operator/outfitter would prevent impacts to environmental resources. Any requests in special recreation use permit applications to remove natural resources would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis after an environmental analysis process.

Recreational Mining and Other Similar Activity. Recreational mining and other similar activities would be limited to a 5-acre site located in the Dickie Springs-Oregon Gulch Placer Mining District area. A recreation site plan would be prepared and implemented to manage the site for recreational purposes.

Continental Peak/South Pass Connecting Side Trail. The Continental Peak/South Pass Connecting Side Trail would be managed the same as described in Alternative 2.

2.6.6 Minerals and Alternative Energy Resources Management

Alternative 3 would allow development as long as sensitive resources are protected from unacceptable impacts.

2.6.6.1 Leasable Fluid Minerals Management

Oil and Gas Leases. In addition to Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2), lease sales would be offered based on industry interest in areas available for leasing and development (Map 42). Development rates in the planning area would be controlled by offering new leases, with stipulations that give BLM the authority to time and sequence development activities. The timing and sequencing restrictions would be implemented in a manner that protects the leaseholder's contract rights, such as placing a lease in suspension until it can be developed without contributing to unacceptable impacts. This would allow interested parties to bid on leases in a systematic manner, whereby they could bid on all available areas in which they have an interest. Imposition of timing and sequencing restrictions would be based on monitoring of sensitive resource indicators that could include, but not be limited to, wildlife population trends, reproduction rates, observed ranges, and habitat integrity. An interdisciplinary team would review the monitoring data and determine acceptable levels of development activity. The timing and sequencing of development on an individual lease would include consideration of the following factors:

- Data trends for indicators of the viability of potentially impacted wildlife and other sensitive resources, including impacts on indicators from other causes, such as disease, drought, or hunting approved through wildlife management activities by BLM or other agencies
- Fragmentation of habitat and migration pathways due to preexisting development
- Net amount of surface disturbance, including approved development activities, that will be implemented in nearby areas and planned reclamation of existing surface disturbances
- Systematic development of the fluid mineral resources by the operator on individual leases and other leases within sensitive resource areas (i.e., allowing development of selected leases by an operator while other leases are held in suspension, followed by successive lease reinstatement and development as previously developed areas are reclaimed).

Lease Stipulations. The lease stipulations notify the leaseholder that development activities may be limited, prohibited, or implemented with mitigation measures to protect specific resources (Table 2-2). As described in the Oil and Gas Leases paragraph for this section, stipulations may include provisions for timing and sequencing of development activities based on monitoring of sensitive resource indicators. Emphasis would be on protection of wildlife and wildlife habitat.

Drilling Permits. In addition to Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2), for new leases BLM would issue COAs on APDs to implement lease stipulations. Operational requirements may include use of remote control for well operations, noise mitigation, and modification of structures for wildlife protection. For existing leases that do not contain stipulations, BLM could issue COAs that would allow necessary impacts for development to be technically feasible or economically viable. COAs for timing limitations would be based on monitoring of sensitive resource indicators, as described in the Oil and Gas Leases and Lease Stipulations paragraphs of this section. All APDs and development actions would be required to be in compliance with 43 CFR 3100. Development actions would not be permitted that did not comply with mandatory resource protection requirements, such as protection of threatened or endangered species and air and water quality regulations. In addition, refer to Section 2.6.4 for additional mitigation measures that may apply as part of the transportation plan.

2.6.6.2 Leasable Solid Minerals Management

Exploration. Most of the planning area would be open to coal exploration activities, with avoidance and mitigation requirements needed to protect the resources (Map 43). Areas closed to coal exploration activities would be similar to those specified for the No Action Alternative. In addition, the Cushion Plant Community ACEC, Pinnacles Geographic Area, Steamboat Mountain ACEC, and greater sage-grouse leks and the ½ mile surrounding them would be closed to coal exploration. The exploration activity would also be required to comply with existing standard practices, best management practices, and guidelines for surface disturbing activities (Appendices 5 and 6).

Leasing. Coal leases could be offered in the parts of the Coal Occurrence and Development Potential Area that are open to leasing, as this area has been evaluated using the 20-point suitability screening process (Map 44). Areas outside this part of the planning area may also be leased for coal development but would have to meet the suitability criteria for coal leasing. To develop a mine on a lease, a mine plan and the required permits from the Office of Surface Mining, Reclamation and Enforcement, and state and local agencies, would have to be prepared. Restrictions on mining activity, such as NSO, or subsurface mining with controls on surface facilities, would be required on coal leases where needed for resource protection. The areas with coal leasing limitations and the areas closed to coal leasing for Alternative 3 are the same as those specified in the No Action Alternative.

2.6.6.3 Locatable Minerals Management

Locatable Mineral Withdrawals. Proposed withdrawals from locatable minerals identified in the Green River RMP would be pursued (Map 45). Withdrawals from mineral location would be pursued in the northern elk calving areas, the potential diamond development area of Steamboat Mountain ACEC, and areas with NSO requirements including active raptor next sites and Indian Gap. Other withdrawals could be pursued, as necessary.

Withdrawals would be revoked for lands classified as prospectively valuable for oil shale. Upon revocation, the area would be open to the filing of mining claims, exploration, and development of locatable minerals. The White Mountain Petroglyphs ACEC and Boars Tusk, located in the oil shale classification lands, would be withdrawn from mineral location prior to the revocation.

Withdrawals would be revoked for lands classified as prospectively valuable for coal. Upon revocation, the area would be open to filing of mining claims, exploration, and development of all locatable minerals. Areas that would be withdrawn from mineral location prior to the revocation of the coal classification include Greater Sand Dunes ACEC (western portion), Crookston Ranch, public water reserves, Indian Gap, Tri-Territory Marker, and South Pass Summit. Because Alternative 3 includes designation of the Special Status Plants ACEC, this area would be withdrawn to implement protection of these plants, which would be an equivalent action to withdrawal of special status plant species sites under the No Action Alternative. Active raptor nest sites would also be pursued for withdrawal. Specific management actions would be taken to provide for recreational mining in the designated area, including removal and stockpiling of soil, and excavating material to provide access for recreational miners.

2.6.6.4 Salable Minerals Management

Mineral Material Sales. The planning area would be open to mineral material sales where required to meet planning objectives, such as construction and maintenance of roads in the approved transportation plan, construction of recreational facilities, or other construction related to approved development activities (Map 46). Mining and reclamation plans would be required for each use of salable mineral materials.

Areas currently closed to mineral material sales would remain closed, with the exception of Steamboat Mountain ACEC. The lava rock portion of Steamboat Mountain would be closed to mineral material sales, and the remainder of the ACEC would be available for salable mineral development as required to meet other planning objectives in this portion of the planning area. Areas closed to mineral materials sales under Alternative 3 would include Crookston Ranch, Oregon Buttes ACEC, Native American burial sites, Boars Tusk, White Mountain Petroglyphs, Sand Dunes ACEC, South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC and viewshed, the lava rock portion of Steamboat Mountain, Special Status Plant Species ACEC, and greater sage-grouse leks with a ½-mile buffer.

2.6.6.5 Alternative Energy Management

Alternative Energy Proposals. The planning area would be open to alternative energy development projects, such as wind or solar farms, consistent with the resource protection requirements and the transportation plan under this alternative. Permits or leases would that would allow these developments to occur would include mitigation requirements to protect sensitive resources, and would meet the location requirements for utility lines and roads required in the transportation plan. Site-specific assessments would be required to identify potential impacts from construction activity and operation noise on wildlife, heritage resources, and visual resources.

2.6.7 Visual Resources Management

The planning area would be managed to maintain or improve scenic quality by managing the impacts of human activities and other intrusions on the visual landscape (Map 47). The VRM classes provide the design standards for all surface disturbing projects. Projects would be designed, sited, screened, or painted to reduce visual impacts regardless of the VRM classification.

VRM Class I Areas. Same as described in Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Section 2.2).

VRM Class II Areas. Management actions on lands classified as VRM Class II would be designed to blend into the natural landscape. A visual transition area of 1 mile adjacent to each WSA would be managed as Class II to retain the existing character of the WSA landscape. A low level of change would be acceptable to the characteristic landscapes of the ACECs, thus South Pass Historic Landscape, White Mountain Petroglyphs, Steamboat Mountain, Special Status Plant Species, and Cushion Plant Community ACECs, and the part of Greater Sand Dunes ACEC outside the WSA would be managed as VRM Class II. Oregon Buttes ACEC lies entirely within the WSA and thus is managed as VRM Class I. Unique geological features and landforms, including Indian Gap and Boars Tusk, Split Rock, portions of White Mountain, the western part of the Red Desert Watershed that falls in the planning area, and the contributing portion of the National Historic Trail and National Scenic Trails, would also be managed as VRM Class II. Surface disturbing activities could be seen in these areas but would not attract the attention of the casual observer.

VRM Class III Areas. Management actions on lands classified as VRM Class III would be designed to partially retain the existing character of the landscape and would allow a moderate level of change. The area known as Eden Valley would be managed as Class III. Surface disturbing activities could attract attention but would not dominate the view of the casual observer.

VRM Class IV Areas. Management actions on lands classified as VRM Class IV could result in a major modification to the existing character of the landscape. The level of change to the landscape could be high. The remainder of the planning area not managed as VRM Class I, II, or III would be managed as Class IV. Surface disturbing activities could dominate the view of the casual observer and would be the major focus of attention.

2.6.8 Management of Special Management Areas and Other Management Areas

Special management areas would continue to be managed to preserve and protect the integrity and character of the specific areas in accordance with ACEC policies and WSA interim management policies. Other resources and locations throughout the planning area that would be worthy of special protections would be designated as special management areas (Map 48).

2.6.8.1 Special Management Areas

2.6.8.1.1 Wilderness Study Areas

Geophysical Activities. Geophysical exploration and related detonation activities would be prohibited.

Rights-of-Way. These areas would be managed as right-of-way exclusion areas.

Locatable Minerals. A plan of operations would be required for all activities greater than casual use.

2.6.8.1.2 Oregon Buttes ACEC

Geophysical Activities. Geophysical activities and related detonation activities would be prohibited in Oregon Buttes ACEC.

Rights-of-Way. The ACEC would be managed as a right-of-way exclusion area.

Recreation. Location of interpretive and directional signs along backcountry byways would be coordinated with state and local governments and other interested parties for Oregon Buttes.

A recreation project plan and interpretive prospectus would be prepared and implemented for Oregon Buttes.

Locatable Minerals. A plan of operations would be required for all activities greater than casual use.

2.6.8.1.3 South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC

Rights-of-Way. The South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC (portion not visible) would be managed as a right-of-way avoidance area. The South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC (visible portion) would be managed as a right-of way exclusion area.

OHV Use. OHV use within the South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC (visible portion) would be limited to designated roads and trails. OHV use within the nonvisible portion would be limited to existing roads and trails.

Leasable Fluid Minerals. The South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC (visible portion) would be open to consideration of fluid minerals leasing with NSO requirements.

The South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC (nonvisible portion) would be open to consideration of fluid minerals leasing consideration with stipulations to protect other resources. Stipulations could include but would not be limited to NSO requirements, CSU, and timing of development activity (Map 42).

Leasable Solid Minerals. The South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC (visible portion) would be closed to leasable solid minerals exploration and leasing.

Locatable Minerals. Withdrawal from mineral location would be pursued on South Pass Summit. Withdrawal from mineral location would also be pursued for the northern elk calving areas in part of the South Pass historic Landscape ACEC.

VRM. The entire ACEC would be managed as a VRM Class II area.

The South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC viewshed would be maintained from approximately 3 miles of the Oregon, Mormon, California, and Pony Express National Historic Trail routes. Intrusions within the viewshed area could be allowed provided the results of a visual analysis indicate they are not visible from the trail routes or that they can be mitigated.

2.6.8.1.4 White Mountain Petroglyphs ACEC

Recreation. A recreation plan and interpretive prospectus would be prepared and implemented.

Leasable Fluid Minerals. The ACEC would be open to consideration of fluid minerals leasing with NSO requirements.

Leasable Solid Minerals. White Mountain Petroglyphs Vista would be closed to coal and sodium exploration.

VRM. The ACEC would be managed as VRM Class II area.

2.6.8.1.5 Steamboat Mountain ACEC

Steamboat Mountain ACEC would be expanded to include all of Indian Gap and the face of Steamboat Mountain. This would include portions of the basin big sagebrush/lemon scurfpea vegetation community (Map 48).

Rights-of-Way. The southern portion of the ACEC would be managed as a right-of-way exclusion area. The remainder of the ACEC would be managed as a right-of-way avoidance area.

Communication Sites. Communication sites would be prohibited in Steamboat Mountain ACEC.

OHV Use. OHV use would be limited to designated roads and trails.

Recreation. Location of interpretive and directional signs along backcountry byways would be coordinated with state and local governments and other interested parties for Steamboat Mountain.

A recreation plan and interpretive prospectus would be prepared and implemented for Steamboat Mountain.

Leasable Fluid Minerals. Steamboat Mountain ACEC would be open to consideration of fluid minerals leasing consideration with stipulations to protect other resources. Stipulations could include but would not be limited to NSO and CSU requirements and timing of development activity (Map 42).

Leasable Solid Minerals. The entire ACEC would be closed to solid leasable solid minerals exploration and leasing.

Salable Minerals. The lava portion of the ACEC would be closed to mineral material sales. The remainder of the ACEC would be open only when required to meet other planning objectives within the JMH CAP planning area.

Locatable Minerals. Withdrawal from mineral location would be pursued in the potential diamond development area of Steamboat Mountain ACEC.

VRM. The entire ACEC would be managed as a VRM class II area.

2.6.8.1.6 Greater Sand Dunes ACEC

The Greater Sand Dunes ACEC would be expanded to include the paleosol deposition area (Map 37).

Rights-of-Way. The ACEC would be managed as a right-of-way avoidance area.

OHV Use. The portion of the ACEC containing the Greater Sand Dunes Recreation Area would be open to OHV use. The remainder of the ACEC would be limited to existing roads and trails.

Leasable Fluid Minerals. The portion of the ACEC outside the WSA would be open to consideration of fluid minerals leasing with stipulations to protect other resources. Stipulations could include but would

not be limited to NSO and CSU requirements and timing of development activity (Map 42). Other portions of the ACEC would be closed to fluid mineral leasing (Map 42).

Leasable Solid Minerals. The western portion of the ACEC would be closed to leasable solid minerals exploration and leasing. The eastern portion of the ACEC within the coal development potential area would be open to leasable solid minerals exploration and leasing using only subsurface mining methods and controls on surface facilities.

Locatable Minerals. Withdrawals from mineral location would be pursued in the western portion of the ACEC.

VRM. The ACEC would be managed as a VRM Class II area.

2.6.8.1.7 Special Status Plants ACEC

The Special Status Plant Species ACEC would be expanded into the JMH CAP area where such species are located (Map 37).

Rights-of-Way. The ACEC would be managed as a right-of-way exclusion area.

OHV Use. The ACEC would be closed to OHV use.

Leasable Minerals. The ACEC would be open to consideration for mineral leasing with NSO requirements.

Leasable Solid Minerals. The ACEC would be closed to coal and sodium exploration.

Salable Minerals. The ACEC would be closed to mineral material sales.

Locatable Minerals. Withdrawals from mineral location would be pursued where special status plants occur.

Rangeland Management. Salt or mineral supplements would not be allowed within ¼ mile of areas where special status plant species occur.

Vegetation treatments would be designed to protect and conform to special status plant species.

2.6.8.1.8 Cushion Plant Community ACEC

Cushion plant communities would be designated an ACEC (Map 37).

Rights-of-Way. The ACEC would be managed as an avoidance area for rights-of-way or other surface disturbing activities.

Leasable Solid Minerals. The ACEC would be closed to leasable solid minerals exploration.

2.6.8.2 Other Management Areas

2.6.8.2.1 Pinnacles Geologic Feature

The Pinnacles Geologic Feature would continue to be managed as part of the Red Desert Watershed Management Area, as provided in the Green River RMP.

Rights-of-Way. The area would be managed as a right-of-way exclusion area.

OHV Use. The area would be closed to OHV use.

Leasable Fluid Minerals. The area would be closed to fluid minerals leasing.

Leasable Solid Minerals. The area would be closed to leasable solid minerals exploration.

Salable Minerals. The area would be closed to mineral material sales.

VRM. The area would be managed as a VRM Class I area.

2.6.8.2.2 Pinnacles Geographic Area

Rights-of-Way. The area would be managed as a right-of-way exclusion area.

OHV Use. The area would be closed to OHV use.

Leasable Fluid Minerals. The area would be closed to fluid minerals leasing.

Leasable Solid Minerals. The area would be closed to leasable solid minerals exploration.

Salable Minerals. The area would be closed to mineral material sales.

VRM. The area would be managed as a VRM Class I.

2.6.8.2.3 Red Desert Watershed Management Area

OHV Use. OHV use would be limited to designated roads and trails.

VRM. The area would be managed as a VRM Class II area.

2.7 PROPOSED JMH CAP

Parts of the Proposed JMH CAP that would amend the Green River RMP may be protested by parties who participated in the planning process and who have an interest that is or may be adversely affected by the approval of the decisions that amend the Green River RMP (43 CFR 1610.5-2). Management actions that may be protested are indicated in *underlined italics* below and in Table 2-1 under the Proposed JMH CAP. For more information on protest requirements see the Dear Reader letter at the beginning of the final EIS.

2.7.1 Management Actions Common to All Resource or Land Use Programs

The Proposed JMH CAP provides opportunities to use and develop the planning area while ensuring resource protection. The alternative would allow development and activities to occur throughout the planning area through an implementation, monitoring, and evaluation management strategy. This strategy establishes indicators to inform BLM of the adverse effects of actions within the planning area and prevents them from becoming significant through BLM's ability to control the timing and location of some development activities. The implementation, monitoring, and evaluation strategy would apply to all land and resource programs in the Proposed JMH CAP.

Monitoring Plan. An implementation, monitoring, and evaluation process, including an interdisciplinary monitoring plan, would be used to evaluate the overall effectiveness of implementing the management decisions for the planning area and used as a basis for making management adjustments.

The primary aspects of the process are an implementation strategy for the process, a monitoring plan, and a list of 12 sensitive resources and uses to help determine what, where, under what conditions, and when areas should be open to surface disturbing or disruptive activities. See Appendix 17 for a detailed description of the management strategy to be employed.

Other detailed aspects of the implementation, monitoring, and evaluation strategy include the following:

Upon completion of the JMH CAP, portions of crucial habitats and other areas of sensitive or important resources would be open to further consideration for various multiple-use activities, so long as crucial habitats and other sensitive or important resources would be protected from irreversible adverse effects. This would be accomplished through an implementation strategy that would include case-by-case review of all proposals, including a 12-point sensitive resource review criteria, application of mitigation measures to protect sensitive resources, and, where applicable, controlled location and timing of the various activities and related reclamation. For example, satisfactory reclamation of surface disturbance may be required before additional surface-disturbing activities would be allowed in big game crucial ranges, migration routes, and birthing areas. *These sensitive resources currently are—*

1. *Active (unstabilized) sand dunes*
2. *Slopes greater than 20 percent*
3. *Special management area values (visual, recreation opportunities, health and safety, cultural/historical, etc.)*
4. *Integrity of the core area wildlife habitat*
5. *Key habitat (unique vegetation and plant communities)*
6. *Key habitat (e.g., escape cover, birthing areas)*
7. *Cultural/Native American respected places, historic values*
8. *Connectivity area (migratory corridor)*
9. *Inaccessible areas (overlapping resource concerns, i.e., sensitive resources 1 to 8, above)*
10. *Special status plant and animal species*
11. *Stabilized dunes*
12. *Visual values (VRM Class I and II areas).*

Portions of the JMH CAP planning area would be closed to long-term surface disturbing and disruptive activity, rights-of-way, fencing, power lines, pipelines, long-term and permanent structures or facilities, mineral leasing, mineral exploration and development activities, rangeland improvements, land treatments, and long-term and permanent land and resource use commitments or allocations, if they would result in irreversible adverse effects. This would be done to satisfy needs for adequate wildlife habitat and use of that habitat (crucial winter range, calving/fawning, migration corridors, etc.), watershed protection, protection of other sensitive resources, and for public health and safety. These are identified as NSO areas in Table 4-8 and Map 50.

Additionally, in portions of Steamboat Mountain ACEC, Greater Sand Dunes ACEC, the White Mountain and Split Rock areas, and the core and connectivity areas, surface-disturbing and disruptive activities

would be subject to extensive review and mitigation that would allow appropriate levels of activity while meeting objectives and safeguarding sensitive resources. Monitoring and evaluation would determine the effectiveness of the management prescriptions and mitigation measures. Adjustments could be made to ensure that further activity would not cause fragmentation and abandonment of habitat and would still meet stated management objectives, safeguard sensitive resources, and not result in irreversible adverse effects. This determination would be based on the effects on elk and their movement patterns and use of habitat, effects on other wildlife species and habitats, public health and safety, watershed condition, and effects on other sensitive resources.

- Portions of the planning area would be closed to oil and gas leasing and development activities (Map 54). Other surface disturbing and disruptive activities in this portion of the planning area would be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. Surface disturbing and disruptive activities such as rights-of-way, fencing, power lines, pipelines, long-term and permanent structures or facilities, rangeland improvements, land treatments, and long-term and permanent land and resource use commitments or allocations may be allowed if they would not result in irreversible adverse effects. Existing oil and gas leases in this portion of the planning area would be recognized, and exploration and development activities on these existing leases would be allowed as appropriate based on site-specific analysis. Intensive mitigation may be required, such as transportation planning; remote control of fluid mineral production facilities to limit travel; multiple-well pads to limit surface disturbances; limiting the number of pads per section in sensitive areas; use of directional drilling to minimize disturbance of sensitive areas; clustering or centrally locating ancillary facilities; shrub reclamation (containerized stock, transplanting, etc.) to restore, rehabilitate, or replace habitat; application of geotechnical material for construction; and potential unitization prior to exploration and development. Other resource projects or proposals could expect a similar in-depth consideration and may require similar mitigation measures (Table 2-2 and Appendix 17).

- Monitoring and evaluation would incorporate information from the elk study conducted in the JMH CAP planning area (see Section 3.1.6.1.3), application of the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing, PFC determinations for riparian areas, and observations of impacts of activities and uses inside and outside the planning area. Appropriate mitigation would be applied to meet planning area management objectives. If it was determined that planning area management objectives were not being met, management would be adapted to address this situation.

Resource indicators, developed as part of the planning area management strategy of the implementation, monitoring, and evaluation process, would be used for determining effects of all activities on all resource values. Consideration would be given to such factors as weather, disease, drought, hunting pressure, introduction of nonnative species, and recreation activities (part of the implementation, monitoring, and evaluation process). Monitoring data would be assessed and response actions would be determined by an interdisciplinary BLM team with input from stakeholders and other public entities, as part of the implementation, monitoring and evaluation process. Timing and sequencing for approving all actions and use authorizations would be applied where feasible, but could be excepted if indicators show effects on resources were within acceptable limits.

2.7.2 Land and Water Resources Management

Management Objective—The planning area would be managed to maintain or enhance land and water resources using ecological principles and science-based performance criteria.

2.7.2.1 General Management Actions for Land and Water Resources

Healthy Rangelands. The Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands would apply to all resource uses on BLM-administered lands. These standards are the minimal acceptable conditions that address the health, productivity, and sustainability of the rangeland. The standards describe healthy rangelands rather than rangeland byproducts. Achievement of a standard is determined through observing, measuring, and monitoring appropriate indicators. An indicator is a component of a system whose characteristics (e.g., presence, absence, quantity, and distribution) can be observed, measured, or monitored based on sound scientific principles. The standards would direct the management of public lands and would focus the implementation of this activity plan toward the maintenance or attainment of healthy rangelands.

Proper Functioning Condition. Riparian areas would be managed to attain and/or maintain a minimum standard of PFC, which is the minimum acceptable level of ecological condition for riparian areas. The PFC for different types of riparian-wetland systems is fully defined in TR 1737-15, "A User Guide to Assessing Proper Functioning Condition and the Supporting Science for Lotic Areas," and TR 1737-16, "A User Guide to Assessing Proper Functioning Condition and the Supporting Science for Lentic Areas." PFC can be summarized as the minimum acceptable level of ecological status where vegetation, landform, and/or woody debris create a level of inherent resiliency that allows the stream or wetland system to be protected from erosive forces, capture sediment, provide for infiltration, and create appropriate habitat. Riparian areas would be maintained, improved, or restored to enhance forage conditions, provide wildlife habitat, and improve stream and water quality. To achieve PFC, riparian areas would be managed to maintain dominance by species capable of stabilizing soils and stream banks. Riparian areas would be assessed on an as-needed basis to determine existing condition and whether specific management actions would be needed for improvement.

Site-specific activity and implementation plans would be prepared where needed to identify methods to achieve or maintain proper functioning condition as a minimum. Plans could include measures to reduce erosion and sediment yield, promote ground cover, and enhance water quality.

Desired Plant Community. Upland and riparian vegetation would be managed to achieve DPC objectives. This is a plant community that produces the kind, proportion, and amount of vegetation necessary for meeting or exceeding the land use plan requirements. DPC objectives for upland and riparian areas would be established for the planning area through individual site-specific activity and implementation planning and as updated ecological site inventory data become available.

The DPC objectives would emphasize wildlife habitat, livestock grazing, watershed, and biodiversity values while maintaining or enhancing habitat for special status species. Particular attention would be given to mountain shrub, basin big sagebrush/lemon scurfpea, aspen, and other unique or important vegetation types. Site-specific DPC objectives are determined by an interdisciplinary team, usually comprised of specialists in soil, vegetation, hydrology, and biology. The team determines desired vegetative conditions for an area by considering ecological potential, current and anticipated resource uses, applicable publications, and professional judgment.

Vegetation Treatments. Vegetative treatments would be designed on a case-by-case basis. Such activities may include seeding, reseeding, fence construction, weed control, and enhancement of fish and wildlife habitat. *Vegetation treatments would be used to abate, alter, or transform vegetation communities in an effort to achieve DPC objectives, protect water quality, dissipate erosion, and conform to requirements to protect or enhance special status plant and/or wildlife species and associated habitats (Appendix 6).* This may include activities such as manual or mechanical manipulation, chemical treatments, and prescribed burns (Appendix 8). Prescribed burns would be the preferred method of vegetation manipulation to convert stands of brush to grasslands and to promote regeneration of aspen

stands and/or shrub species. Prescribed burns would generally be conducted in areas having greater than 35 percent sagebrush composition, 20 percent desirable grass composition, and greater than 10 inches of precipitation. Low-intensity burns during periods of high soil moisture would be the preferred method/times in mountain shrub communities. Prescribed burns would be restricted in areas with coal or other fossil fuel outcrops. All vegetation treatments should be designed to be irregular in shape for edge effect, cover, and visual aesthetics. Areas proposed for treatment with prescribed burns would be rested 1 full year prior to treatment (unless vegetation cover prior to burning had adequate fine fuels to carry the fire) and 24 months after treatment, unless an onsite analysis determined that this time frame should be expanded or reduced. Treatments in aspen communities would be fenced on a case-by-case basis.

Herbicide loading sites would be prohibited within 500 feet of water sources, floodplains, riparian areas, and special status plant locations and would be used in accordance with the guidelines in Appendix 8, Standard Operating Procedures for Range Improvements and Vegetation Manipulations.

Fences. Where documented wildlife conflicts with fencing on public lands occur, fences would be modified, reconstructed or, if necessary, removed. Herding control of livestock would be encouraged as an alternative to fencing. Fence construction would be in accordance with BLM design standards and located so as not to overly impede wildlife movement. Consideration would also be given to special status species and wild horse movement.

Watershed Health Assessments. Watershed health assessments would be initiated to determine the condition of riparian areas and would be prioritized based on levels of development, rangeland standards, PFC, and other available data. Those watersheds with more sensitive baseline conditions would be the focus for increased monitoring efforts and mitigation.

Native Vegetation. Native vegetation would be managed to allow natural plant succession to continue, with emphasis on mountain shrub, basin big sagebrush/lemon scurfpea, aspen, and other unique or important vegetation types.

2.7.2.2 Fire Management

Management Objective—The planning area would be managed to use prescribed fire as a management tool to help meet multiple use resource management goals and to provide cost effective protection from wildfire to life, property, and resource values.

Fire Management Implementation Plan. Fire management in the planning area would be implemented through the Fire Management Implementation Plan for BLM-Administered Public Lands in the State of Wyoming. The plan emphasizes protecting natural resources and property while recognizing the essential role fire plays in restoring and maintaining the health of the public lands. The primary objectives of the plan are to use prescribed fire as a management tool to help meet multiple use resource management goals and to provide cost effective protection from wildfire to life, property, and resource values. The plan would be reviewed and updated as necessary to be consistent with federal wildland fire policy and the National Fire Plan.

Fire Suppression. Wildland and prescribed fires would be managed in all vegetation types to maintain or improve biological diversity and the overall health of the public lands. In particular, plant species and age class diversity would be a priority; thus all wildfires would be suppressed to some degree depending on their potential impact on vegetation communities. Suppression techniques would be identified to reduce wildfire on portions of the landscape where fire could cause undesirable changes in plant community composition and structure. Full fire suppression for basin big sagebrush/lemon scurfpea plant communities would be applied. A site-specific analysis would be prepared for sensitive resource areas,

such as special status plant species sites, heritage sites, historic trails, and ACECs, to determine the type of fire suppression activity that would be acceptable.

2.7.2.3 Water Resources Management

Management Objective—The planning area would be managed to stabilize and conserve soils, to increase vegetative production, to maintain or improve surface and ground water quality, and to protect, maintain, or improve wetlands, floodplains, and riparian areas.

Water Quality. All surface disturbing activities would be required to adopt design strategies that serve to reduce erosion and maintain or improve water quality. The area within 500 feet of wetlands, riparian areas, and 100-year floodplains and the area within 100 feet of the edge of the inner gorge of intermittent and large ephemeral drainages would be avoidance areas for surface disturbing activities. Surface disturbing activities could be permitted within avoidance areas, provided that a mitigation plan is approved and a site-specific analysis determines that adverse impacts would not occur as a result of the activity.

Permanent Facilities. Permanent facilities such as storage tanks and structure pits would not be allowed in 100-year floodplains, wetlands, and riparian areas. *However, structures that would enhance the protection and management of 100-year floodplains, wetlands, and riparian areas would be considered.* Proposals for linear crossings in these areas would be considered on a case-by-case basis.

Erosion Control. Areas with highly erodible soils would be avoidance areas for all surface disturbing activities. Surface disturbing activities could be permitted within avoidance areas, provided that a mitigation plan is approved and a site-specific analysis determines that unacceptable impact levels would not occur as a result of the activity. When applicable, erosion control plans would be required as part of surface disturbing project proposals.

Colorado River Salinity Control. BLM would continue to participate with federal, state, and local government agencies to develop and implement salinity control plans for the Colorado River Basin and to maintain existing and future applicable water quality plans.

Wetlands and Floodplains. Wetlands and floodplains would be managed in accordance with Executive Orders 11988 and 11990 and section 404 of the Clean Water Act. In addition, projects to improve the ecological integrity of the dunal ponds would be considered and evaluated.

Riparian Management Exclosures. Riparian exclosures could be maintained and/or modified based on site-specific analysis. Where site-specific analysis determines they no longer serve their purpose, they could also be removed. New exclosures could be developed if they would benefit resources. Riparian exclosures are used to protect degraded riparian areas from further impacts associated with livestock grazing and to ensure reclamation of vegetation communities and ecological processes. Exclosures would remain closed to livestock grazing, and AUMs in these exclosures would not be available for livestock use.

Fluid Mineral Wells. Water wells constructed to provide water for drilling of fluid mineral wells (oil, gas, or coalbed gas wells) would be constructed in compliance with BLM regulations for resource protection. Hydrogeologic investigations would be required where there was a reasonable expectation that surface water features were in connection with geologic formations being dewatered. Such investigations would serve to determine the extent of the potential impact and provide information that could assist in mitigation of undesirable effects related to development. Attributes that could trigger a hydrogeologic investigation would include, but would not be limited to, preexisting designation of an area

as a recharge zone; similar water chemistry between surface waters and proximity of a proposed project to ground water; shallow water tables; springs and/or seeps; wetlands; streams or water courses; and/or underlying lithology that suggests surface/ground water communication, such as dipping geologic beds, fractures in the underlying rocks, and shallow producing zones. Mitigation requirements would also be implemented as needed to protect surface waters. Appropriate measures would be applied to protect ground water quality and prevent commingling of aquifers (Appendix 6)

Aquifer Recharge Areas. Aquifer recharge areas would be managed to maintain or enhance recharge volume and ground water quality by limiting road density and surface occupancy to maintain a healthy recharge area. Studies would be conducted in relation to specific projects to better define aquifer recharge area boundaries.

2.7.2.4 Wild Horses Management

Management Objective—The planning area would be managed to protect, maintain, and control viable, healthy herds of wild horses in the Divide Basin Herd Management Area (HMA) at Appropriate Management Levels (AML) while retaining their free-roaming nature, to provide adequate habitat for free-roaming wild horses through management consistent with principles of multiple use and environmental protection, and to provide opportunity for the public to view wild horses.

Wild Horse Herd Management Area Boundaries and Appropriate Management Levels. Wild horse populations would be managed within the Great Divide Basin HMA at an AML of 415 to 600 horses. The Great Divide Basin HMA boundaries would remain unchanged.

Activity and Monitoring Plans. Land use decisions and site-specific activity planning would focus on ensuring that adequate forage was available to support the AML. Site-specific activity planning would be implemented to support herd management decisions throughout the entire Great Divide Basin HMA. Annual monitoring data would be collected to evaluate progress toward meeting management goals and objectives.

Water Developments. Water developments would be provided as needed to improve wild horse herd distribution and manage forage utilization. *Water developments within sensitive wildlife habitats would be considered only if wildlife habitat and resource conditions were improved or maintained.* Compatibility with special status plant species would be required.

Gathering Plan. A selective gathering plan would be developed and implemented to remove excess horses from inside and outside the HMA to maintain the existing AMLs. Gathering cycles would vary by gathering plan objectives, resource conditions, and needs. Fertility control would be initiated only if necessary.

Public Education. Public education and enjoyment of wild horse herds is an important component of the National Wild Horse and Burro Program. Portions of this program would be implemented in the Great Divide Basin HMA by providing interpretive signs and access sites for viewing horses.

2.7.2.5 Livestock Grazing Management

Management Objective—The planning area would be managed to improve forage production and ecological conditions for the benefit of livestock use while providing for other resource values.

Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management. The Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management (Appendix 10) would apply to all livestock grazing

activities on public lands. These standards and guidelines address management practices at the grazing allotment management plan (AMP) and watershed levels and are intended to maintain desirable conditions or improve undesirable rangeland conditions within reasonable time frames. If livestock grazing were determined to be a factor in not meeting the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands, appropriate management actions would be implemented, as determined through cooperation between BLM, livestock operators, and interested publics. Achieving the standards or making significant progress toward achievement of the standards would be the first priority for all grazing allotments.

Rangeland and Riparian Habitat. Implementation of grazing management systems (AMP) would assist in improving or maintaining the desired range condition. Approved AMPs, or other activity plans intended to serve as the functional equivalent to an AMP, for each of the designated grazing allotments would provide the necessary guidance for achieving grazing management objectives. Appropriate actions for improving degraded rangeland and riparian habitat could include, but would not be limited to, reduction of permitted AUMs, modified turnout dates, livestock water developments, range improvements, modified grazing periods, growing season rest, riparian pastures, exclosures, implementation of forage utilization levels, and livestock conversions.

Forage Utilization Levels. Forage utilization levels for upland and riparian species would be in accordance with individual AMPs or other activity plans intended to serve as the functional equivalent of an AMP. Determination of forage utilization levels would be based on PFC guidelines, BLM reference handbooks, and professional judgment.

Livestock Water Developments and Range Improvements. Livestock water developments and range improvements would be considered to maintain or improve resource conditions and/or enhance livestock distribution. Compatibility with special status plant species would be required. *Water developments and/or range improvements proposed in sensitive wildlife habitat would be considered only if wildlife habitat and resource conditions were maintained or improved.*

Salt or Mineral Supplements. Salt or mineral supplements would be prohibited within 500 feet of riparian habitat and National Historic and Scenic Trails, unless analysis showed that these resources would not be adversely affected. These supplements would also be prohibited on areas inhabited by special status plant species, regardless of analysis findings. *Placement of salt blocks at least 500 feet away from wells, troughs and other human-made water sources would be encouraged to better distribute livestock.*

2.7.2.6 Vegetation Management

Management Objective—The planning area would be managed to maintain or enhance vegetation community health, composition, and diversity to meet watershed, wild horse, wildlife, and livestock grazing resource management objectives and to provide for plant diversity (desired plant communities).

Special Status Plant Species. Special status plants are those species federally listed as threatened or endangered, proposed for listing, or candidates for listing under the ESA. They also include species designated by each BLM State Director as sensitive and any species designated by a state agency in a category implying potential endangerment or extinction. The State of Wyoming does not have an official list of designated sensitive, threatened, or endangered plant species. Surveys would be conducted of potential habitat for federally listed, proposed, or candidate threatened and endangered plant species prior to any surface disturbance. Should any such species be found, all disruptive activities would be halted until species-specific protective measures were developed and implemented. For listed species, protective measures would be developed and implemented with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS).

Specific management actions related to known locations of special status species habitat include closing locations to surface disturbing activities or any disruptive activity that could adversely affect the plants or their habitat and closing locations of special status species to location of new mining claims, mineral material sales, OHV use, including vehicles used for geophysical exploration activities and surveying, and use of explosives and blasting. Known locations of special status plant species would be open to consideration for mineral leasing with no surface occupancy (NSO) requirements.

Special status species potential habitat areas would be areas of controlled surface use (CSU) for surface disturbing activities.

Rights-of-Way Limitations. Areas where Wyoming BLM sensitive plant species are known to exist and/or have potential habitat, would be right-of-way avoidance areas (Map 49). Exceptions could be granted by the Authorized Officer if analysis shows that there is no adverse impact to the plant populations.

Fire Suppression. A site-specific analysis would be prepared for all fire management actions around special status plant species sites to determine the appropriate fire management response. Fire equipment and fire suppression techniques, such vegetation clearing, would be limited to existing roads and trails in special status plant species habitat.

Threatened and Endangered Plant Species. Surveys would be conducted of potential habitat for federally listed, proposed, or candidate threatened and endangered plant species prior to any surface disturbance or depletion of water sources. Should a species be located, formal consultation with USFWS would occur. Management prescriptions to provide, maintain, or improve habitat would be developed on a case-by-case basis.

Invasive Species. An invasive species is one that is nonnative to a particular ecosystem, and its introduction is likely to cause harm to the economy, environment, or human health. Federal agencies are directed under Executive Order 13112 to expand and coordinate efforts to prevent the introduction and spread of invasive species. Preventing the introduction and proliferation of invasive species would be accomplished through close monitoring and containment of infestations and through implementation of best management practices for all surface disturbing activities (Appendix 6). Public education regarding invasive species and the means to address them would also be promoted.

Forest and Woodland Health. Management of conifer and aspen communities would be designed to promote forest and woodland health. Old decadent trees may be left standing or downed to provide cover or other habitat for wildlife (Animal Inn). Animal Inn is an education and information program focused on the value of dead, dying, and hollow trees for wildlife and fish.

2.7.2.7 Wildlife Habitat Management

Management Objective—The planning area would be managed to maintain, improve, or enhance the biological diversity of wildlife species while ensuring healthy ecosystems, to restore disturbed or altered habitat, with the objective of attaining desired native plant communities, while providing for wildlife needs and soil stability, and, to the extent possible, to provide suitable wildlife habitat and forage to support the WGFD strategic plan population objectives.

Habitat Management Plan. A habitat management plan (HMP) identifies management actions to be implemented to achieve specific objectives related to RMP decisions. An HMP focuses on priority species and their habitats; therefore, the plan is generally limited to a specific geographic area. Plans would include habitat expansion efforts, threatened and endangered species reintroduction, and

population goals and objectives (in coordination with the WGFD). These plans would guide BLM in managing and rehabilitating wildlife habitat in site-specific locations within the planning area. HMPs would be prepared as needed for highly disturbed areas to mitigate wildlife habitat losses. To the extent possible, suitable wildlife habitat and forage would be provided to support the WGFD Strategic Plan objectives. Changes in the WGFD planning objective levels would be considered based on habitat capability, availability, and site-specific analysis.

Water Developments. Wildlife water developments would be considered on a case-by-case basis to maintain or improve wildlife habitat and resource conditions.

Special Status Wildlife Species. Special status wildlife species are those species federally listed as threatened or endangered, proposed for listing, or candidates for listing under the ESA. They also include species designated by each BLM State Director as sensitive, and any species designated by a state agency in a category implying potential endangerment or extinction.

Federal agencies are required to ensure that actions they authorize, fund, or carry out are not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of species listed as threatened or endangered or adversely modify or destroy their critical habitat under the ESA. The ESA requires federal agencies (e.g., BLM) to consult with the USFWS to determine whether their actions may affect any listed or proposed species and to document their determinations in a Biological Assessment (Appendix 3). Land use decisions would be implemented with appropriate conservation measures or with reasonable and prudent alternatives to avoid jeopardizing any species or habitat or to avoid the need to list species or their habitat.

Surveys or searches would be conducted of potential habitat for federally listed, proposed, or candidate threatened and endangered wildlife species prior to any surface disturbance. Should a special status wildlife species be found, all disruptive activities would be halted until species-specific protective measures developed with the USFWS could be implemented. BLM would take proactive measures to improve habitat character on an as-needed basis per BLM 6840 policy and section 7 of the ESA. Specific management actions related to known locations of special status species habitat are outlined in Table 2-1.

Sensitive Habitat. Crucial winter range or sensitive habitats, birthing areas, the connectivity area (migration corridor), nesting sites, and sensitive fisheries habitats would be maintained or improved. This would be accomplished by maintaining habitat or reducing habitat loss or alteration, improving habitat where possible, and by applying appropriate mitigation requirements (e.g., distance and seasonal limitations, rehabilitation) to all appropriate activities. Exceptions could be provided on a case-by-case basis should exception criteria (Appendix 4) be met. Seasonal limitations for wildlife habitat would be applied as necessary to protect sensitive wildlife areas from development and/or disruptive activities during crucial times in a wildlife species' lifecycle, such as nesting, birthing, and wintering. Wildlife seasonal stipulations would not close an area to development but would protect wildlife species if weather or other habitat needs dictate that it is necessary (Appendix 5). BLM may grant exceptions to seasonal limitations if the wildlife biologist, in consultation with the WGFD, concluded that granting an exception would not jeopardize the population being protected. Criteria for exceptions are outlined in Appendix 4 of this document. Seasonal limitations for the Proposed JMH CAP are shown in Table 2-3.

Predator Damage Control. BLM would continue to coordinate with APHIS-WS and review their annual management plan for animal damage control activities on public lands. *Proposed animal damage control activities not compatible with BLM planning and management prescriptions or objectives for other resource activities and uses would be identified on a case-by-case basis. BLM would determine appropriate planning strategies, with input from APHIS-WS.*

The JMH CAP planning area would be designated as a "restricted control area" for predator control in coordination with APHIS-WS. Restricted control areas are public land areas where predator damage management may be planned, but control activities may be limited to certain methods or times of the year. Emphasis would be placed on nonlethal methods. Control techniques and methods would be discussed at an annual meeting.

Greater Sage-Grouse Leks, Nesting and Early Brood-Rearing Habitat. Site-specific evaluations would be conducted for breeding habitat (leks, nesting and early brood-rearing). Field searches conducted as part of these evaluations would determine if the site has the vegetation composition, height, and cover needs necessary to support greater sage-grouse breeding activities (Appendices 4, 5 and 6).

Surface occupancy (long-term or permanent aboveground facilities) would be controlled within ¼ mile of greater sage-grouse leks unless adverse impacts could be mitigated. Distances would be subject to change on a case-by-case basis dependent on applicable scientific research and site-specific analysis. Disruptive activities would also avoid occupied greater sage-grouse leks during appropriate evening and early morning hours, usually from 8:00 p.m. to 8:00 a.m. daily. The actual area to be avoided and appropriate time frame (typically March 1 to May 15) would be determined and applied on a case-by-case basis.

Seasonal limitations on surface disturbing and disruptive activities (usually from March 15 to July 15) would apply in nesting and early brood-rearing habitat (Map 50). These limitations would be determined and applied on a case-by-case basis. In addition, nesting and early brood-rearing habitats would be protected from habitat degradation, and measures would be taken to improve habitat quality within the areas identified on Map 50, on an as-needed basis.

Greater Sage-Grouse Winter Range. Disruptive activities would be prohibited in greater sage-grouse winter range usually from November 15 to March 15 (Map 50). These areas are subject to change based on new data and scientific information.

All Greater Sage-Grouse Habitats (Leks, Nesting, Early Brood-rearing, and Winter Range). The management practices in greater sage-grouse habitats would be designed to limit direct loss of habitat and prevent habitat degradation. Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would avoid these habitats. Measures would be taken to improve habitat character on an as-needed basis in conformance with BLM 6840 policy and to the extent possible, with the Wyoming Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Plan (WGSGCP).

Avoidance areas may vary depending on natural topographic barriers, terrain, type of activity, line-of-sight distance, vegetation structure and cover, habitat needs, and other such factors. Exceptions to avoidance areas and seasonal limitations could be provided on a case-by-case basis provided appropriate mitigation could be implemented (Appendix 6 provides examples) and the exception criteria (Appendix 4, Procedures for Processing Proposals for Land Use Authorizations in areas of Seasonal Restriction) have been met.

The actual area to be avoided and appropriate time frames would be determined on a case-by-case basis dependent on applicable scientific research and site-specific analysis and in coordination with commodity users and other appropriate entities.

Mitigation of adverse effects (e.g., noise and traffic) on all habitats would be determined and applied on a case-by-case basis.

Maintenance and Operational Activities in all Greater Sage-Grouse Habitats. In greater sage-grouse habitats, surface disturbing maintenance and operational activities would require mitigation measures or

development plans. These mitigation measures or development plans would be based on local situations on a case-by-case basis.

Big Game Winter Range. Disruptive activities would be prohibited in big game (elk, deer, and antelope) crucial winter range between November 15 and April 30 (Map 50). Seasonal limitations may be excepted, provided criteria in the Procedures for Processing Applications in Areas of Seasonal Restriction (Appendix 4) can be met and appropriate mitigation can be implemented (as determined by BLM in coordination with commodity users).

Big Game Birthing Areas. Surface disturbing and disruptive activities and the amount of habitat disturbed would be limited in big game birthing areas from May 1 to June 30.

Black-Footed Ferret. The USFWS has established survey protocols for the black-footed ferret (listed as endangered under the ESA). Surveys for black-footed ferrets would be completed according to current USFWS protocol within 1 year prior to conducting any surface disturbing or disruptive activities in all or portions of potential ferret habitat areas (prairie dog colonies 200 acres or greater in size) because of the close association of the two species (Appendix 3). Should a ferret be found, all disruptive activities would be stopped until protective measures developed with the USFWS could be implemented. Surface disturbing activities could proceed provided the surveys result indicated no presence of black-footed ferrets.

BLM would cooperate with USFWS and WGFD on any black-footed ferret reintroduction within the JMH CAP planning area.

Measures would be taken, as appropriate, to reduce potential raptor perches in and around prairie dog towns and colonies, such as constructing anti-perch devices on power poles.

Mountain Plover. Mountain plover surveys would be required prior to authorizing any surface disturbing or disruptive activities in potential plover habitat. Surveys would be conducted within suitable mountain plover habitat by a qualified biologist using protocol determined by the Rock Springs BLM biologist. Active mountain plover nesting aggregation areas (Map 17) would be avoidance areas for surface disturbing and disruptive activities within ¼ mile of the area from April 10 to July 10.

Traffic speeds on BLM roads during the brood-rearing period (June and July) would be limited within ¼ mile of nesting aggregation areas. Exceptions or other mitigation measures could be applied on a case-by-case basis, as determined by BLM in coordination with commodity users.

Measures (e.g., avoidance, burying power lines, installation of antiperch devices, and exclusion for artificial nest structures) would be taken to limit hunting perches or artificial nest sites for avian predators within ¼ mile of nesting aggregation areas.

Game Fish and Special Status Fish Species. Seasonal limitations for surface disturbing activities to protect game and special status fish species during spawning would be applied.

Raptor Nesting Sites. Active and historic raptor nesting sites (Map 17) would be protected and managed (e.g., through distance restrictions) for continued nesting activities. Different species of raptors may require different types of protective measures. Permanent or high-profile structures would be prohibited within a specified distance of active raptor nests. Distance would be determined on a case-by-case basis and would depend on the raptor species involved, natural topographic barriers, line-of-sight distances, and other such factors. Temporary disturbances associated with placement of facilities, such as pipelines, and other actions such as seismic activities, could be allowed within ½ to 1 mile of active raptor nests.

Disruptive activities would be seasonally restricted within a ½ to 1-mile radius of occupied raptor nesting sites. Raptor nest surveys would be conducted within a 1-mile radius or linear distance of proposed surface uses or activities during raptor nesting season (see Table 2-3 for dates which vary by species). Seasonal limitations may be excepted, provided criteria in the Procedures for Processing Applications in Areas of Seasonal Restriction (Appendix 4) can be met, and appropriate mitigation can be implemented (as determined by BLM in coordination with commodity users).

Introduction and Reintroduction of Species. BLM would cooperate with the Wyoming Game and Fish Department (WGFD) in studies for the introduction and reintroduction of native and nonnative (game) wildlife and fish species.

BLM would cooperate with the USFWS in studies for, and reintroduction of, special status species.

2.7.3 Heritage Resources Management

Management Objective—The planning area would be managed to expand the opportunities for scientific study and educational and interpretive uses of cultural and paleontological resources, protect and preserve important cultural and paleontological resources and/or their historic record for future generations, resolve conflicts between cultural/paleontological resources and other resource uses, and to foster opportunities for Native Americans to use heritage resources.

The State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) would be consulted under provisions of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) on any potential effects on heritage resources. Sites that are not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) would be managed on a case-by-case basis according to their values. Sites that are listed or eligible for listing on the NRHP would be managed for their local, regional, and national significance in accordance with the NHPA and the Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA). Sites would be managed to ensure against adverse effects, through proper mitigation if disturbance or destruction is not avoidable. Mitigation may include scientific information retrieval as well as other measures, such as interpretation and improved public appreciation of the heritage resource.

Heritage Resources Protection. Heritage resources in special management areas would remain protected through specific and general management actions (mitigation requirements and site-specific management prescriptions) associated with designated ACECs, WSAs, and National Historic Trails (Appendix 7). Heritage resources are found in the Greater Sand Dunes ACEC (including Boars Tusk and Crookston Ranch), White Mountain Petroglyphs ACEC, South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC (including the Oregon, California, Mormon Pioneer, and Pony Express National Historic Trails), and the Tri-Territory Marker (Map 2). Other areas may be identified and included in the future pursuant to procedures, including public participation, outlined in Appendix 7.

Protection of Scientific Values. Management of heritage resources would include inventories and mitigation as needed for specific projects. An appropriate level of analysis of all surface disturbing activities would be conducted to determine the potential effect of the activity on the resource and its eligibility for listing on the NRHP. Site stewardship and public education aspects of the Heritage Resource Program would continue to be implemented. Sites eligible for inclusion in the NRHP because of their scientific value would be protected. Preservation of the scientific information would be the preferred mitigation method should any such sites have to be impacted by other activities. These sites include Finley, Krmpotich, and Eden-Farson archaeological sites and the paleosol deposition area. Other sites will be included as they are located, recorded, and evaluated for NRHP eligibility.

The paleosol deposition area, including the Finley, Krmpotich, and Eden-Farson archaeological sites and geological deposits in the area, has been identified as an important heritage resource area. *The paleosol deposition area would be designated the West Sand Dunes Archaeological District Special Management Area to be managed for scientific study, education, and interpretation.* Site locations would be kept confidential, and surface disturbance would be limited in the vicinity. Heritage resource inventories in this area would be required to include analysis of subsurface deposits to ascertain whether they include important archaeological materials. *Subsurface inventory would be required by remote sensing techniques, hand-dug test excavations, or mechanical testing prior to issuing any surface disturbing authorizations in the West Sand Dunes Archaeological District. Subsurface testing would require an approved testing plan and BLM–SHPO consultation. Mitigation may include research-oriented data recovery excavation.* The testing strategy should be appropriate to meet the goal of finding buried paleosols and evaluating their potential association with archaeological materials.

The Finley site would be nominated to the NRHP under the Register's History of American Archaeology context and under the Earliest Americans context.

The Krmpotich site would be nominated to the NRHP under the Register's Earliest Americans context.

National Register Eligible Sites. All National Register-eligible historic sites would be protected through provisions of the NHPA and ARPA. Sites eligible for inclusion in the NRHP under Criterion D because of their scientific information content would be surrounded by a 100-foot avoidance area, pursuant to the Protocol Agreement between BLM and SHPO (Appendix 7). Other select NRHP eligible sites would be nominated to the NRHP. BLM may request development proponents to fund preparation of NRHP nominations on a case-by-case basis. Sites with uncommon values may require different case-specific management.

Native American Sites. Areas located in Steamboat Mountain, Steamboat Rim, White Mountain Rim, Essex Mountain, Monument Ridge, Joe Hay Rim, and the Indian Gap Trail have been identified as respected places, which may include sacred sites or Traditional Cultural Properties of Native Americans. These areas would continue to be protected by provisions of the NHPA and AIRFA. Consultation with Tribal leaders in accordance with the NHPA and AIRFA concerning management of all identified Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs), sacred sites and respected places would continue on a regular basis. *When activity is proposed in the vicinity of TCPs, sacred sites and/or eligible respected places, management would be developed through consultation with Tribal leaders, SHPO and the activity proponent based on the characteristics of the site and the proposed activity. Mitigation may include siting activity in such a way as to protect the foreground viewshed of the area of concern, if appropriate.* Viewshed management goals would correspond with existing VRM classifications. This may necessitate limiting, or mitigating the visibility of permanent intrusions generally within a 270-degree radius from the identified respected place to the prominent landscape features.

The Indian Gap Trail would be researched and mapped and a trail interpretive plan would be developed.

Surface disturbance and disruptive activities would be prohibited within a specified distance, but not less than 100 feet, of these and other Native American respected places. Actual distance would be determined on a case-by-case basis.

Expansion Era Roads and Associated Sites. Expansion Era roads would be managed similar to the historic trails covered in the Oregon/Mormon Pioneer National Historic Trails Management Plan (BLM 1986), with prescriptions from that plan applied, although the ¼-mile protective setback might not always be applicable. Management actions would include development of activity plans with the objective of

preserving the historical integrity of significant NRHP contributing segments of the historic roads. Activity plans may include NRHP nomination of those Expansion Era roads that qualify.

Historic Livestock Management Sites. Numerous livestock tending campsites and other pastoral agricultural sites have been identified throughout the JMH CAP planning area. Some of these locations may be eligible for inclusion in the NRHP within the context of the development of pastoral agriculture in Wyoming and the Rocky Mountain region. These sites would continue to be protected under provisions of the NHPA. *NRHP eligible historic livestock management sites would be protected from surface-disturbing activities within a minimum area of 100 feet.*

Native and Euro-American Sites. Historic and archaeological sites within the context of early contact between Native Americans and Euro-American peoples have been identified, but they are understood only in general terms. The historical context of these sites would continue to be developed, and an interpretive program would be developed to improve public appreciation of these locations. Some or all of these sites may be nominated to the NRHP and/or included in the Backcountry Byways program.

Paleontological Sites. Documented significant fossil sites would be avoided to protect scientific and educational values. Management guidelines included in BLM Handbook 8270-1 would apply. If impacts are unavoidable, the site would be evaluated by a BLM-approved paleontologist (and may require a paleontological survey), who would coordinate with BLM in developing a mitigation plan. The mitigation plan may include activity monitoring, fossil documentation, recovery, and storage in a federally approved repository.

Unique Geologic Features. The Boars Tusk area would be closed to surface disturbing activities, mineral material sales, and use of explosives and blasting. The area within a ½ mile radius of Boars Tusk (including Boars Tusk) would be closed to blasting and explosive charges. The Boars Tusk area would be open to consideration of activities such as fencing, interpretive signs, or transportation barriers to ensure protection of the site; however, facilities would be prohibited from being developed on the geologic feature. The Boars Tusk area would be a right-of-way avoidance area. The Boars Tusk and approximately 1,400 acres of BLM-administered public lands in the surrounding area would be closed to any surface mining activity, but open to consideration of subsurface mining methods. Activities or ancillary facilities related to subsurface mining would be prohibited.

The Pinnacles Geologic Feature (about 1,300 acres) would be an exclusion area for rights-of-way. Surface use would also be controlled. The use of explosives on and within ½ mile of the Pinnacles Geologic Feature would be prohibited. The VRM classification for the Pinnacles Geologic Feature would be Class II. Vehicular travel within ½ mile of the Pinnacles Geologic Feature, and including the features, would be limited to designated roads and trails. The Pinnacles proper would be closed to surface disturbance.

Mineral leasing and mineral locations actions would be as described in Section 2.7.6.

Tri-Territory Marker. The Tri-Territory Marker would be an exclusion area for rights-of-way, and would be closed to surface disturbing activities. The Tri-Territory Marker would be withdrawn from mineral location and closed to coal and sodium exploration. The Tri-Territory Marker would be open for consideration of activities such as fencing, interpretive signs, or barriers to ensure protection of the area.

2.7.4 Travel, Access, and Realty Management

Management Objective—The public lands in the planning area would be managed to support the goals and objectives of other resource programs, respond to public demand for land use authorizations, and acquire administrative and public access where necessary.

Transportation Planning. A transportation plan for the JMH CAP planning area would be developed in coordination with local governments and users. The transportation plan could include mitigation measures (such as offsite placement of facilities, remote control monitoring, restricted or prohibited surface use including road construction, multiple wells from a single pad, central tank batteries/facilities, pipelines and power lines concentrated in specific areas, all based on site-specific analysis) in areas subject to seasonal limitations and CSU and NSO stipulations. Transportation planning would include coordination with local governments, stakeholders, and other publics.

Transportation planning would provide for access to achieve multiple use goals while providing maximum protection for crucial habitats and sensitive resources. Transportation planning would consider—

- Limiting points of access for all activities to minimize disruption.
- Closing and rehabilitating unused roads and trails and those causing resource damage. This would be subject to county review of existing rights-of-way needs. The transportation plan and affected maps would be corrected to reflect closed roads and trails.
- Avoiding construction of stream or riparian area crossings in sensitive areas, and closure of unnecessary crossings. Exceptions may be granted if crossings would reduce adverse effects, benefit area objectives, and reduce miles of road and/or frequency of use. Bridges (versus culverts) would be required for perennial stream crossings.
- Limiting development zones to be accessed by designated routes.

Travel Management Plan. In conjunction with the overall transportation planning for JMH, travel management plans (Map 29) would be developed for the two northern calving areas and the Steamboat Mountain, White Mountain, and Essex Mountain areas to control access in these areas.

Road Installations. Proposed road installations and improvements would follow the Green River RMP management objectives and applicable BLM guidelines until a JMH transportation plan is prepared and approved. Exceptions to the plan would address site-specific conditions to minimize impacts on natural and cultural resource values. Proposed roads and improvements for Steamboat Mountain and White Mountain would follow the guidelines specified in Appendix 12.

Geophysical Activities. The planning area would be open to geophysical exploration and related detonation activities, subject to appropriate mitigation and the same limitations applied to rights-of-way (Map 49). Exploration activities would be allowed in sensitive resource areas only if they could be performed with acceptable mitigation of impacts. Geophysical exploration (vehicles and detonation) activities would be prohibited in WSAs. *Geophysical exploration (vehicles and detonation) activities would be prohibited within ½ mile of the Pinnacles Geologic Feature* and would not be allowed in areas of sensitive heritage resources and geologic features, such as Boars Tusk, White Mountain Petroglyphs, special status plant species, and historic trails. Exceptions may be granted on a case-by-case basis, subject to appropriate site-specific analysis and mitigation requirements.

Rights-of-Way. The planning area, with the exception of defined exclusion and avoidance areas, would be open to considering grants of rights-of-way

The extent of right-of-way exclusion and avoidance areas, based on the location of specific sensitive resources, would be as shown on Map 49.

Linear Rights-of-Way. To the extent possible, utility and transportation rights-of-way would be located to coincide with existing roads, trails, and other right-of-way or easement concentration areas where they would not create safety hazards or conflict with other resource objectives.

Winter Access. Winter access would be subject to seasonal road closures. Where winter access on roads other than those identified for winter access in the transportation plan is necessary, routes would be determined on a case-by-case basis in accordance with transportation planning requirements. Plowing of roads would be considered on a case-by-case basis.

Off-Highway Vehicle Management. Management of OHV activities would be in accordance with Executive Order 11644, as amended by Executive Order 11989, and applicable regulations (43 CFR 8340) that address the use of OHVs on public lands. Designation and authorization of OHV use would be controlled to protect resource values, promote safety of users, and minimize conflict among various uses of public lands. OHV designations include Open, Limited to Designated Roads and Trails, Limited to Existing Roads and Trails, and Closed (see Glossary for definitions). Where OHV designations have not been made by BLM, use would be limited to existing roads and trails.

Public lands in the JMH CAP planning area would remain open, limited, or closed (Map 52). The OHV management prescriptions identified in the Green River RMP would be implemented. In addition to these designations, *the Pinnacles Geologic Feature would be closed to OHV use, and OHV use would be limited to designated roads and trails in the South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC (portion not visible), cushion plant community, and Steamboat Mountain Management Area.*

Specific roads and trails may be closed to OHV use for public health and safety reasons, restoration or remediation actions, or other valid reasons.

Specific roads and trails may be closed or seasonally closed to OHV use on an as-needed basis for public health and safety reasons, restoration or remediation actions, habitat protection, or for other valid reasons as determined by BLM (Map 52).

Exceptions to closed or limited OHV designations may be granted by the Authorized Officer in consideration of such factors as scientific purposes and emergency access needs.

Over-the-Snow Vehicles. Travel by over-the-snow vehicles would be limited to the OHV designations and BLM trails designated for snow vehicle access. Any travel off existing routes would be considered on a case-by-case basis.

Land Withdrawals and Exchanges. Public lands would be retained in federal ownership unless it was determined to be in the best public interest to dispose of some of them.

Land withdrawals and exchanges identified in the Green River RMP would be pursued. Exchanges would conform to the JMH planning objectives and actions. BLM acquisition of lands would be considered to facilitate various resource management objectives. The preferred method for acquisition would be through exchange. Land exchanges are considered discretionary and voluntary real estate transactions between the willing parties involved. Exchanges for state lands in WSAs and other special

management areas would be considered to ensure easier and consistent management in these areas. Exchanges would be considered to acquire state or private lands that hold high cultural and historical value; important resource values, such as habitat for threatened and endangered species; and that would facilitate resource management objectives, such as preventing habitat fragmentation.

Ownership Adjustments. Aquatic, wetland, and riparian habitat would not be suitable for disposal unless opportunities existed for land exchanges of equal or greater value (including monetary and functional resource values).

Access. Access to public, state, and private land would be provided throughout the planning area and would be restricted only where necessary to protect public health and safety and to protect sensitive resources. Access would be guaranteed across public lands to landlocked private and state lands consistent with the guidelines and objectives set forth in the FLPMA. Access decisions would be consistent with existing regulatory requirements and would be made for the purposes of providing for the reasonable use and enjoyment of inholdings.

2.7.5 Recreation Resources Management

Management Objective—The planning area would be managed to ensure the continued availability of outdoor recreational opportunities sought by the public, while providing for other resource values, to meet legal requirements for the health and safety of visitors, and to reduce conflicts between recreation and other types of resource uses.

Management of recreation resources would comply with applicable regulations (43 CFR 8300 et al.) for functions and activities, such as OHV, visitor services, special recreation use permits, and commercial operations. All management actions and recreation uses would focus on the health and safety of the user and would provide for recreational opportunities while protecting sensitive resources.

Backcountry Byways. Recreation project plans would be developed for the Backcountry Byways program (Tri-Territory Loop and Red Desert) and would include interpretive and directional signs. The location of these signs would be coordinated with state and local governments and other interested parties for the Red Desert viewpoint from the dugway of Steamboat Mountain, the Chicken Springs overlook, Steamboat Mountain, Oregon Buttes, Honeycomb Buttes, and Indian Gap.

Greater Sand Dunes Recreation Area. A recreation site plan would be prepared for expansion of the parking area and camping facilities in the Greater Sand Dunes Recreation Area. This plan would address public health and safety, resolving user conflict, and protecting adjoining resources.

Recreation Project Plans. Recreation project plans and interpretive prospectuses would be developed as needed to address public demand and use of the Crookston Ranch historic site, Boars Tusk, wild horse viewing areas, Oregon Buttes, Honeycomb Buttes, Steamboat Mountain, National Historic Trails, White Mountain Petroglyphs, Indian Gap, and other Native American sites.

Camping. Overnight camping would be allowed throughout the planning area, including WSAs, in accordance with BLM guidelines. Dispersed camping would be allowed within 200 feet of a water source except where necessary to protect water quality and wildlife and livestock watering areas. Camping designations are a discretionary action approved by a BLM Authorized Officer. Areas would be closed to camping if resource damage occurred.

Special Recreation Use Permits. Special recreation use permits for managed activities that would occur in the JMH CAP planning area would be reviewed and subject to recommendations made by the RSFO.

This would allow the RSFO to track the amount, location, and timing of organized activity occurring within the planning area to monitor resource pressure. The permit evaluation process would consider the nature of the event, potential impacts to resources, conflicts with other events, and impacts to the quality of other visitors' experiences. Mitigation measures necessary to protect the resources would be included in any permit issued. A plan of operation would be required for all commercial recreational operators and outfitters. The plan would describe the type, extent, and location of the recreation use and the mechanisms by which the operator/outfitter would prevent impacts to environmental resources. Any requests in special recreation use permit applications to remove natural resources would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis after an environmental analysis process.

Recreational and Other Similar Mining Activity. Recreational mining and other similar activity would be allowed in those parts of the planning area that are not withdrawn from mineral location, or where such withdrawals would not be pursued. Withdrawn areas include the White Mountain Petroglyphs ACEC. Withdrawals would be pursued for the Steamboat Mountain diamond potential area, the western portion of the Greater Sand Dunes ACEC, South Pass Summit, Tri-Territory Marker, Crookston Ranch, Pinnacles Geologic Feature, Public Water Reserves, special status plant species locations, and the northern elk birthing areas.

Continental Peak/South Pass Connecting Side Trail. The Continental Peak/South Pass Connecting Side Trail would be managed as a side trail to the existing Continental Divide National Scenic Trail (CDNST). Management would be as described for the CDNST (BLM 1999). Existing primitive two-track roads, BLM roads that provide legal public access through certain private lands, segments of cross-country travel on BLM-administered public land, and an existing trail would be used as components of the CDNST. The existing primitive two-track roads and BLM road segments would continue to be open to motorized use. Cross-country travel routes would not be open to motorized use.

2.7.6 Minerals and Alternative Energy Resources Management

Management Objective—The planning area would be managed to maintain or enhance opportunities for mineral exploration and development while providing for other resource values.

All minerals and energy resource management actions would recognize valid existing rights and ensure compliance with existing legal and regulatory requirements. These would include leases issued under the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 and Amendments, mining claims filed under the Mining Act of 1872, and existing permits for sales of mineral materials.

2.7.6.1 Leasable Fluid Minerals Management

Oil and Gas Leases. Areas that cannot be offered for lease include WSAs and other areas where fluid mineral leasing and development would not be in compliance with other laws or with land use planning decisions that prohibit fluid mineral leasing and development in certain areas (Map 54).

Upon completion of the JMH CAP, fluid mineral leasing, exploration, and development would be allowed in portions of the planning area with necessary mitigation. To meet the resource goals and objectives for the JMH CAP planning area (including providing adequate habitat and use of that habitat (crucial winter range, calving/fawning, migration corridors, etc.)), protection of sensitive resources, and protection of public health and safety, some areas would be closed to leasing (Map 54). Approximately 92,260 acres in portions of the Steamboat Mountain ACEC, Greater Sand Dunes ACEC, White Mountain Petroglyphs ACEC, Oregon Buttes ACEC, South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC, the White Mountain and Split Rock areas, and the core and connectivity areas would be closed to future oil and gas leasing (Area 3, Figure

A17-1, Appendix 17). As existing leases expire in Area 3 they would not be reoffered for lease (approximately 88,200 acres).

The remainder of the planning area would be open to fluid mineral leasing. Plan implementation would provide that Area 2 be open to leasing, considering such factors as operational need, resource recovery, geology, and ability to mitigate impacts. Appropriate stipulations would be applied to protect sensitive resources. Approximately 35,500 acres (based on a ½-mile perimeter; see Appendix 17, Figures A17-1 and -2) along the perimeter of Area 3 would be available for leasing with an NSO stipulation. Although current technologies suggest that the ½-mile perimeter is adequate at this time, these NSO areas may be expanded to include additional adjacent acreage provided the JMH CAP objectives could be met.

To determine the effectiveness of lease stipulations/conditions of approval (COA) and to provide guidance for adopting new or modified stipulations/COAs, as needed to meet resource objectives, monitoring of sensitive resource indicators would occur. Indicators could include, but would not be limited to, wildlife population trends, reproduction rates, observed ranges, and habitat integrity. An interdisciplinary team would review the monitoring data to ensure that impacts were not exceeding acceptable levels as determined through this analysis (Appendix 17). Development levels may be adjusted and/or additional stipulations and COAs may be applied to new leases and proposed activities as appropriate and necessary to protect resource values. Proposed changes would be analyzed in subsequent NEPA documents (such as site-specific NEPA for well sites) in accordance with law and policy. Changes will be based on consideration of the following factors:

- *Data trends for indicators on the viability of potentially impacted wildlife and other sensitive resources, including impacts on indicators from other causes, such as disease, drought, or hunting*
- *Fragmentation of habitat and migration pathways due to development activities*
- *Net amount of surface disturbance, including approved development activities that will be implemented in nearby areas, and planned reclamation of existing surface disturbances*
- *Amount and location of actual land use activity.*

Under the implementation, monitoring, and evaluation strategy, suspended leases in the planning area that were put in place during preparation of the JMH CAP would be reinstated within 3 years of signing the Record of Decision, or earlier with an approved development plan (Appendix 17).

As leases expire within the portions of the planning area identified as open to future leasing (Areas 1 and 2), they would be considered for subsequent lease offerings on a case-by-case basis and include stipulations identified in Table 2-2 and stipulations identified through monitoring as described in the implementation, monitoring, and evaluation management strategy (Appendix 17 and the Lease Stipulations paragraph (below)). Proposed changes would be analyzed in subsequent NEPA documents (such as site-specific NEPA for well sites) in accordance with law and policy.

Buyout or exchange of existing leases from willing sellers may be considered on a case-by-case basis. Congressional legislation would be required to authorize lease buyouts.

Lease Stipulations. The lease stipulations would be based on the resources and land use decisions. The lease stipulations would notify the leaseholder that development activities may be limited, prohibited, or implemented with mitigation measures to protect specific resources. *Lease stipulations are identified in Table 2-2.* The stipulations would condition the leaseholder's development activities and provide BLM

with the authority to require other mitigation or to deny some proposed exploration and development methods. The general types of resource protections in lease stipulations include:

- CSU through limitation on the amount and type of surface disturbance
- CSU through avoidance of other resources
- Timing restrictions on development activity
- NSO.

Monitoring data would be assessed and appropriate management actions would be identified by an interdisciplinary BLM team (with input from stakeholders and other publics). Consideration would be given to such factors as weather, disease, drought, hunting pressure, introduction of nonnative species, and recreation activities. Lease stipulations may be adjusted or clarified (consistent with lease rights) based upon these data. Twelve basic sensitive resources and uses would be used to evaluate these lands and ensure that the appropriate mitigation is provided. These sensitive resources and uses may change or be added to in the future based upon the implementation, monitoring, and evaluation strategy (Section 2.7.1 and Appendix 17). If the evaluation concluded that planning area management objectives are not being met, adjustments would be made to remedy the situation.

Drilling Permits. A site-specific analysis would be performed prior to any development to identify and locate resource elements in the lease area that would require protection or mitigation measures. *Any surface disturbing and disruptive activities involved with development of existing leases would be subject to extensive review and mitigation that would allow appropriate levels of activity while meeting objectives and protecting sensitive resources in the area.*

BLM specialists would review sensitive resources with lease operators to develop and implement measures to allow for effective development operations where impacts could be avoided or mitigated. COAs for Applications for Permit to Drill (APDs) would allow necessary impacts for development to be technically feasible or economically viable (Appendix 14).

COAs for APDs would be based on site-specific analysis and would establish specific, necessary mitigation measures, not covered by stipulations, for resource and environmental protection (with emphasis on all interdisciplinary values), such as mitigation of effects to sensitive resources, seasonal limitations, noise reduction, and remote control operations. Some areas would need more intensive mitigation measures to protect sensitive resources and provide for public health and safety. These intensive mitigation measures or COAs would mostly apply to areas with overlapping sensitive resources (e.g., Areas 2 and 3 [Appendix 17]). Exceptions to lease stipulations and COAs would be allowed when site-specific analyses showed impacts to sensitive resources were within acceptable limits. See Appendix 4 for criteria for exceptions in areas with timing limitations (seasonal restrictions). Well spacing requirements for oil and gas resource protection would defer to the Wyoming Oil and Gas Conservation Commission guidance, with consideration for surface resource values. Timing of activities would be considered where consistent with lease rights and COAs for timing limitations would be based on monitoring of sensitive resource indicators, under the implementation, monitoring, and evaluation strategy, to ensure that unacceptable impacts do not occur. In addition, refer to Section 2.7.4 for additional mitigation measures that may apply as part of the transportation plan.

2.7.6.2 Leasable Solid Minerals Management

Exploration. Most of the planning area would be open to coal exploration activities, with avoidance and mitigation requirements needed to protect the resources (Map 55). Areas closed to coal exploration activities under the No Action Alternative (WSAs and Steamboat Mountain ACEC outside the area of

coal recommendation) would remain closed. *In addition, Steamboat Mountain Management Area (outside the area of coal recommendation) would also be closed.*

Leasing. Lands within the Coal Occurrence and Development Potential Area have been identified as having a known or assumed potential for coal development (Map 56). These lands are reviewed against 20 criteria to determine whether they would be suitable for development (43 CFR 3461). These criteria consider existing resource values, such as heritage resources, scenic values, wildlife, threatened and endangered species, natural landmarks, and watersheds. The coal planning decisions made in the GRRMP apply (see Appendix 2). Lands within the planning area with coal development potential (Map 56) have been through the 20-point unsuitability criteria screening and multiple-use conflict analysis. Areas closed to coal leasing (unsuitable) include the western portion of Greater Sand Dunes ACEC, which includes the Sand Dunes WSA (Map 57). Lands within the planning area that have been through the 20-point unsuitability criteria screening process and would be acceptable for further coal leasing and development consideration (with appropriate conditions) are shown on Map 57.

Important geological, ecological, and historic resources would be open to consideration for coal leasing and development by subsurface mining methods. Such areas acceptable for coal leasing that would include NSO requirements include Boars Tusk and Crookston Ranch. Areas acceptable for coal development by subsurface mining and controls on surface facilities include Steamboat Mountain ACEC, the eastern part of Greater Sand Dunes ACEC, Tri-Territory Marker, and raptor nest sites with a ½- to 1-mile buffer. *The portions of the Steamboat Mountain Management area within the Coal Occurrence and Development Potential Area would also be acceptable for leasing for subsurface mining with CSU.* Leasing in big game habitat would be allowed provided that adequate habitat and overall activity levels can be maintained.

Areas outside this part of the planning area may also be considered for leasing for coal development but would have to be reviewed through the site-specific application of the coal screening process and would have to meet the suitability criteria for coal leasing. Restrictions on mining activity, such as NSO, or subsurface mining with controls on surface facilities, would be required on coal leases where needed for resource protection.

2.7.6.3 Locatable Minerals Management

Locatable Mineral Withdrawals. Proposed withdrawals from locatable minerals identified in the Green River RMP would be pursued (Map 53). Other withdrawals could be pursued as necessary. *Withdrawals from mineral location would be pursued in the northern elk calving areas (aspen stands plus adjacent, potential aspen habitat), the potential diamond development area of Steamboat Mountain ACEC, and the Pinnacles Geologic Feature.*

Withdrawals would be revoked for lands classified as prospectively valuable for oil shale. Upon revocation, the area would be open to the filing of mining claims, exploration, and development of locatable minerals. The White Mountain Petroglyphs ACEC, located in the oil shale classification lands, would be withdrawn from mineral location prior to the revocation.

Other areas that would be withdrawn from mineral location prior to the revocation of the coal classification include Greater Sand Dunes ACEC (western portion), special status plant sites, Crookston Ranch, public water reserves, Tri-Territory Marker, and South Pass Summit.

Valid existing rights to develop locatable mineral claims under the Mining Act of 1872 would be recognized (Map 53). In areas open to mineral location, mining claims could filed which would allow that claim be held and developed in accordance with applicable regulations (43 CFR 3809). Mining

activities would also have to comply with other regulatory requirements, including limitations on air and water discharges, waste management, spill prevention, and endangered species.

Surface disturbing exploration activities of 5 acres or less on mining claims would require a notice to BLM. A plan of operations would be required for exploration-related surface disturbances greater than 5 acres, for all surface disturbances greater than casual use, and for a disturbance of any size in ACECs, WSAs, areas closed to OHV use, and any lands or waters known to contain Federally proposed or listed threatened or endangered species or their proposed or designated critical habitat. A plan of operations would specify how the operator intends to manage the mining operation and location of surface disturbing activities, including pits, adits or shafts, placement of waste rock and mine tailings, mills, conveyors, and surface impoundments.

2.7.6.4 Salable Minerals Management

Mineral Material Sales. Existing contracts for sales of mineral materials, such as sand and gravel, would be recognized. Mining of mineral materials would comply with applicable regulatory requirements (43 CFR 3600) and air and water quality protection regulations. A site-specific analysis would be performed before any exploration or extraction activity to identify and locate resource elements that would require protection or mitigation measures. Mineral material sales that pose impacts, that cannot be adequately mitigated, to identified cultural and historic resources and other sensitive resources would not be allowed. The Proposed JMH CAP would allow development as long as sensitive resources are protected from unacceptable impacts.

The planning area would be open to mineral material sales where required to meet planning objectives, such as construction and maintenance of roads in the approved transportation plan, or construction of recreational facilities, or other construction related to approved development activities (Map 58). Mining and reclamation plans would be prepared for each use of salable mineral materials to provide protection for sensitive resources and to restore disturbed areas.

Areas currently closed to mineral material sales would remain closed. These would include Crookston Ranch, Oregon Buttes ACEC, Native American burial sites, Boars Tusk, White Mountain Petroglyphs, Greater Sand Dunes ACEC, South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC (visible portion), South Pass Summit, raptor nesting sites, WSAs, and special status plant species. *Other areas closed to mineral materials sales would include the lava rock portion of Steamboat Mountain ACEC, the Pinnacles Geologic Feature, greater sage-grouse leks, and ½ mile around lek perimeter.*

The remainder of Steamboat Mountain ACEC and the Steamboat Mountain Management Area would be available for salable mineral development only when required to meet other planning objectives within the planning area. Greater sage-grouse nesting habitat would be open to mineral material sales only if related disturbance and reclamation could occur during one field season (Aug. 1 to Nov. 15) and the site could be returned (through reclamation efforts) to a condition usable by greater sage-grouse.

2.7.6.5 Alternative Energy Management

The planning area would be open to alternative energy development projects, such as wind or solar farms, consistent with the resource protection requirements and the transportation plan under this alternative. Permits or leases that would allow these developments to occur would include mitigation requirements to protect sensitive resources and would meet the location requirements for utility lines and roads required in the transportation plan. Site-specific assessments would be required to identify potential impacts from construction activity and operation noise on wildlife, heritage resources, and visual resources.

2.7.7 Visual Resources Management

Management Objective—The planning area would be managed to maintain or improve scenic values and visual quality; and to establish priorities for managing the visual resources in conjunction with other resource values.

The VRM classes provide the design standards for all surface disturbing projects (Map 59). Projects would be designed, sited, screened, or painted to reduce visual impacts regardless of the VRM classification.

The four VRM classes (I, II, III, IV) set standards for planning, designing, and evaluating projects by identifying various permissible levels of landscape alteration while protecting overall regional scenic quality. The scenic quality of an area is a measure of its visual appeal. The VRM class objectives range from very limited management activity (Class I) to activity allowing major landscape modifications (Class IV). Visual resource classes would be retained or modified to enhance other resource objectives, such as heritage resources, recreation uses, wild horse viewing, and special management areas. Projects would be designed to meet the objectives of established visual classifications, and appropriate mitigation would be applied.

VRM Class I Areas. The WSAs would be managed as VRM Class I areas to preserve the natural setting and existing character of the landscape. Oregon Buttes ACEC and the western portion of Greater Sand Dunes ACEC, which fall within a WSA, would also be managed as VRM Class I areas.

VRM Class II Areas. Management actions on lands classified as VRM Class II would be designed to retain the existing character of the landscape. A visual transition area of 1 mile adjacent to each WSA would be managed as Class II to retain the existing character of the WSA landscape. A low level of change would be acceptable to the characteristic landscapes of the ACECs, thus the eastern portion of Greater Sand Dunes ACEC, South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC, and White Mountain Petroglyphs ACEC would be managed as VRM Class II areas (Map 59).

Steamboat Mountain ACEC, Steamboat Mountain Management Area, and unique geological features and landforms, including portions of White Mountain, Pinnacles Geological Feature, and the West Sand Dunes Archaeological District, would also be managed as VRM Class II areas (Map 59).

VRM Class III Areas. Split Rock, Eden Valley, portions of White Mountain, and the portion of the Red Desert Watershed within the planning area would be managed as VRM Class III (Map 59).

VRM Class IV Areas. All areas not managed as VRM Class I, II, or III for this alternative would be managed as VRM Class IV (Map 59).

2.7.8 Management of Special Management Areas and Other Management Areas

Management Objective—Special management areas would be managed to maintain or enhance the resource values and characteristics for which these areas were designated as special management areas.

Special management areas would continue to be managed to preserve and protect the integrity and character of the specific areas in accordance with ACEC policies and WSA interim management policies. Other resources and locations throughout the planning area that would be worthy of special protections would be designated as special management areas (Map 60).

2.7.8.1 Special Management Areas

2.7.8.1.1 Wilderness Study Areas

Geophysical Activities. Geophysical exploration and related detonation activities would be prohibited in these areas.

OHV Use. These areas would be closed to OHV use.

Leasable Fluid Minerals. These areas would be non-discretionary closure areas for fluid minerals leasing.

Leasable Solid Minerals. These areas would be closed to leasable solid minerals exploration and leasing.

Salable Minerals. These areas would be closed to mineral material sales.

Locatable Minerals. A plan of operations would be required for all activities greater than casual use.

VRM. These areas would be managed as VRM Class I area to preserve the natural setting and existing character of the landscape.

2.7.8.1.2 Oregon Buttes ACEC

Geophysical Activities. Geophysical activities and related detonation activities would be prohibited within the ACEC.

Rights-of-Way. The ACEC would be managed as a right-of-way exclusion area.

OHV Use. The ACEC would be closed to OHV use.

Recreation. Location of interpretive and directional signs along backcountry byways would be coordinated with state and local governments and other interested parties for Oregon Buttes.

A recreation project plan and interpretive prospectus would be prepared and implemented for Oregon Buttes.

Leasable Fluid Minerals. The ACEC would be closed to consideration of fluid minerals leasing.

The area would be managed as an NSO area for other surface disturbing and disruptive activities.

Leasable Solid Minerals. The ACEC would be closed to leasable solid minerals exploration and leasing.

Salable Minerals. The ACEC would be closed to mineral material sales.

Locatable Minerals. A plan of operations would be required for all activities greater than casual use.

VRM. The ACEC would be managed as a VRM Class I area.

2.7.8.1.3 South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC

Rights-of-Way. The South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC (visible portion) would be managed as a right-of-way exclusion area *for any right-of-way action that would adversely affect the viewshed (such as major transmission facilities or high profile facilities)*. The non-visible portion would be a right-of-way avoidance area.

OHV Use. OHV use within the entire ACEC would be limited to designated roads and trails.

Leasable Fluid Minerals. *A portion of the South Pass Historic Landscape would be closed to fluid mineral leasing (Map 54).* Portions of the South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC (visible portion) would be open to consideration of fluid minerals leasing with NSO requirements. *Portions of the South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC would be open to consideration of fluid minerals leasing consideration with stipulations to protect other resources. Stipulations could include but would not be limited to NSO requirements, controlled surfaced use, and timing of development activity. As leases expire in the area open to leasing consideration, they would be considered for subsequent lease offerings on a case-by-case basis with lease stipulations to protect sensitive resources. Leases that expire in the area identified as closed to fluid mineral leasing would not be considered for subsequent lease offerings. A portion along the perimeter of the area identified as closed to future oil and gas leasing (Figure A17-2, Appendix 17) would be considered for leasing with an NSO stipulation.* The existing stipulations established in the Green River RMP would still apply in the management of the visible and non-visible portions of the historic landscape.

Leasable Solid Minerals. South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC (visible portion) would be closed to leasable solid minerals exploration and leasing.

Salable Minerals. South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC (visible portion) would be closed to mineral material sales.

Locatable Minerals. Withdrawal from mineral location would be pursued on South Pass Summit. Withdrawal from mineral location would also be pursued for the northern elk calving areas in part of the South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC.

VRM. The entire ACEC would be managed as a VRM Class II area.

The South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC viewshed would be maintained from approximately 3 miles of the Oregon, California, Mormon Pioneer, and Pony Express National Historic Trails. Intrusions within the viewshed area could be allowed provided the results of a visual analysis indicate they are not visible from the trail routes or that they can be mitigated.

2.7.8.1.4 White Mountain Petroglyphs ACEC

Rights-of-Way. The ACEC would be managed as a right-of-way exclusion area.

OHV Use. The ACEC would be closed to OHV use outside of identified access and designated parking areas.

Recreation. A recreation project plan and interpretive prospectus would be prepared and implemented.

Leasable Fluid Minerals. The ACEC would be closed to fluid minerals leasing consideration.

The area would be managed as an NSO area for other surface disturbing and disruptive activities.

Leasable Solid Minerals. White Mountain Petroglyphs Vista would be closed to coal and sodium exploration.

Salable Minerals. The ACEC would be closed to mineral material sales.

Locatable Minerals. Withdrawal from mineral location would be pursued.

VRM. The ACEC would be managed as VRM Class II area.

2.7.8.1.5 Steamboat Mountain ACEC

Steamboat Mountain ACEC would be expanded to include the highest concentration and overlap of unique habitat features, natural systems, and cultural values. These include a portion of the sand dunes stabilized by the basin big sagebrush/lemon scurfpea plant community, and the Native American respected places of Indian Gap and portions of the Indian Gap Trail (Map 60).

Rights-of-Way. The ACEC would be managed as a right-of-way avoidance area.

Communication Sites. Communication sites would be prohibited in Steamboat Mountain ACEC.

OHV Use. OHV use would be limited to designated roads and trails.

Recreation. Location of interpretive and directional signs along backcountry byways would be coordinated with state and local governments and other interested parties for Steamboat Mountain.

A recreation project plan and interpretive prospectus would be prepared and implemented for Steamboat Mountain.

Leasable Fluid Minerals. Most of the ACEC would be closed to fluid minerals leasing consideration (Map 54). The remainder of the ACEC would be open to consideration of fluid minerals leasing consideration with stipulations to protect other resources. Stipulations could include but would not be limited to NSO and CSU requirements and timing of development activity. As leases expire in the area open to leasing consideration, they would be considered for subsequent lease offerings on a case-by-case basis based upon such factors as operational need, resource recovery, geology, and ability to mitigate impacts. Leases that expire in the area identified as closed to fluid mineral leasing would not be considered for subsequent lease offerings. A portion along the perimeter of the area identified as closed to future oil and gas leasing (Figure A17-2, Appendix 17) would be considered for leasing with an NSO stipulation.

Leasable Solid Minerals. The portions of Steamboat Mountain ACEC within the coal development potential area would be open to leasable solid minerals exploration and leasing using only subsurface mining methods and controls on surface facilities (Map 57).

Those portions outside the coal development potential area would be closed to leasable solid minerals exploration and leasing (Map 55 and Map 57).

Salable Minerals. The lava portion of the ACEC would be closed to mineral material sales. The remainder of the ACEC would be open only when required to meet other planning objectives within the JMH CAP planning area.

Locatable Minerals. Withdrawal from mineral location would be pursued in the potential diamond development area of Steamboat Mountain ACEC.

VRM. *The entire ACEC would be managed as a VRM Class II area.*

2.7.8.1.6 Greater Sand Dunes ACEC

The Greater Sand Dunes ACEC designation and boundaries would remain unchanged (Map 14).

Rights-of-Way. The ACEC would be managed as a right-of-way avoidance area (within 1 mile or the visual horizon, whichever is closer).

OHV Use. The portion of the ACEC containing the Greater Sand Dunes Recreation Area would be open to OHV use. The remainder of the ACEC would be limited to existing roads and trails.

Recreation. A recreation site plan would be prepared for expansion of the parking area and camping facilities at the Greater Sand Dunes Recreation Area. The plan would address public health and safety, resolving user conflicts, and protecting adjoining resources.

Leasable Fluid Minerals. A portion of the ACEC outside the WSA would be open to consideration of fluid minerals leasing with stipulations to protect other resources. Stipulations could include but would not be limited to NSO and CSU requirements and timing of development activity. Other portions of the ACEC would be closed to fluid mineral leasing (Map 54).

As leases expire in the area open to leasing consideration, they would be considered for subsequent lease offerings on a case-by-case basis based upon such factors as operational need, resource recovery, geology, and ability to mitigate impacts. Leases that expire in the area identified as closed to fluid mineral leasing would not be considered for subsequent lease offerings.

Leasable Solid Minerals. The western portion of the ACEC would be closed to leasable solid minerals exploration and leasing. The eastern portion of the ACEC within the coal development potential area would be open to leasable solid minerals exploration and leasing using only subsurface mining methods and controls on surface facilities.

Salable Minerals. The ACEC would be closed to mineral material sales.

Locatable Minerals. Withdrawals from mineral location would be pursued in the western portion of the ACEC.

VRM. The ACEC would be managed as a VRM Class II area.

2.7.8.1.7 Special Status Plants ACEC

The Special Status Plant Species ACEC (identified in the Green River RMP) could be expanded into the Jack Morrow Hills CAP area on a case-by-case basis.

Disruptive Activities. Potential habitat of special status plant species' communities on federal lands or on split estate lands would require searches for the plant species prior to approving any project or activity. Should species be found, all disruptive activities would be halted until species-specific, protective measures are developed and implemented. For listed species, protective measures would be developed and implemented in coordination with the USFWS.

Rights-of-Way. Areas where special status plants occur would be managed as rights-of-way avoidance areas.

OHV Use. Areas where special status plants occur would be closed to OHV use.

Leasable Fluid Minerals. Known locations of special status plant species would be open to consideration for mineral leasing with NSO requirements *unless they occur in the area identified as closed to fluid mineral leasing (Map 54).*

Leasable Solid Minerals. Areas where special status plants occur would be closed to coal and sodium exploration as identified in the Green River RMP.

Salable Minerals. Areas where special status plants occur would be closed to mineral material sales.

Locatable Minerals. Withdrawals from mineral location would be pursued where special status plants occur.

Rangeland Management. Salt or mineral supplements would not be allowed in areas where special status plant species occur.

Vegetation treatments would be designed to conform to requirements to protect or enhance special status plant species.

Herbicide loading sites would be prohibited within 500 feet of special status plant locations and would be utilized in accordance with the guidelines in Appendix 8, Standard Operating Procedures for Range Improvements and Vegetation Manipulations.

Fire Management. Fire suppression vehicular activities would be limited to existing roads and trails in special status plant species habitat.

A site-specific analysis would be prepared for all fire management activities around special status plant species sites to determine the appropriate fire management response.

2.7.8.1.8 West Sand Dunes Archaeological District

The paleosol deposition area would be designated a separate special management area called the West Sand Dunes Archaeological District to be managed for scientific study, education, and interpretation.

Rights-of-Way. The area would be managed as a right-of-way avoidance area.

Leasable Fluid Minerals. Most of the area would be open to consideration for fluid minerals leasing with requirements to protect sensitive resources. *Approximately 6,660 acres would be closed to fluid mineral leasing (Map 54). A portion along the perimeter of the area identified as closed to future oil and gas leasing (Figure A17-2, Appendix 17) would be considered for leasing with an NSO stipulation.*

VRM. *The area would be managed as a VRM Class II area.*

2.7.8.2 Other Management Areas

2.7.8.2.1 Pinnacles Geologic Feature

The Pinnacles Geologic Feature would continue to be managed as part of the Red Desert Watershed Management Area, as provided in the Green River RMP.

Rights-of-Way. The area would be managed as a right-of-way exclusion area.

Geophysical Activities. Geophysical exploration vehicles and detonation activities would be prohibited within ½ mile of the Pinnacles Geologic Feature.

OHV Use. The area would be closed to OHV use.

Leasable Fluid Minerals. The area would be closed to fluid minerals leasing consideration (Map 54).

Salable Minerals. The area would be closed to mineral material sales.

Locatable Minerals. Withdrawals from mineral location would be pursued.

VRM. *The area would be managed as a VRM Class II area.*

2.7.8.2.2 Pinnacles Geographic Area

The Pinnacles Geographic Area would continue to be managed as part of the Red Desert Watershed Management Area, as provided in the Green River RMP.

Leasable Fluid Minerals. The area would be closed to fluid minerals leasing consideration (Map 54). A portion along the perimeter of the area identified as closed to future oil and gas leasing (Figure A17-2, Appendix 17) would be considered for leasing with an NSO stipulation.

2.7.8.2.3 Steamboat Mountain Management Area

The Steamboat Mountain Management Area is a geographic area which would include the Steamboat Mountain ACEC, the Steamboat Mountain ACEC proposed expansion, and additional area containing other important Native American cultural values, important watershed values, unique wildlife habitat features, and crucial and overlapping big game habitat.

Rights-of-Way. The Steamboat Mountain Management Area would be managed as a right-of-way avoidance area.

OHV Use. OHV use would be limited to designated roads and trails.

Leasable Fluid Minerals. Approximately 77,000 acres would be closed to fluid mineral leasing (Map 54). The remainder of the area would be open to consideration of fluid mineral leasing with mitigation to protect sensitive resources.

As leases expire in portions of the area open to leasing consideration, they would be considered for subsequent lease offerings on a case-by-case basis with lease stipulations to protect sensitive resource. As leases expire in other portions (Area 2 in Appendix 17) of the area open to leasing consideration, they would be considered for subsequent lease offerings on a case-by-case basis based upon such factors as operational need, resource recovery, geology, and ability to mitigate impacts. Leases that expire in the area identified as closed to fluid mineral leasing would not be considered for subsequent lease offerings. A portion along the perimeter of the area identified as closed to future oil and gas leasing (Figure A17-2, Appendix 17) would be considered for leasing with an NSO stipulation.

Leasable Solid Minerals. The Steamboat Mountain Management Area (outside area with coal recommendation) would be closed to leasable solid minerals exploration.

The entire Steamboat Mountain Management Area would be open to solid minerals leasing for subsurface mining with controls on surface activities and facilities.

Salable Minerals. The Steamboat Mountain Management Area would be closed to mineral material sales.

VRM. The Steamboat Mountain Management Area would be managed as a VRM Class II area.

2.7.8.2.4 Red Desert Watershed Management Area

Leasable Fluid Minerals. Approximately 42,250 acres would be closed to fluid mineral leasing (Map 54). The remainder of the area would be open to consideration of fluid mineral leasing with mitigation to protect sensitive resources. *As leases expire in portions of the area open to leasing consideration, they would be considered for subsequent lease offerings on a case-by-case basis with lease stipulations to protect sensitive resource. As leases expire in other portions (Area 2 in Appendix 17) of the area open to leasing consideration, they would be considered for subsequent lease offerings on a case-by-case basis based upon such factors as operational need, resource recovery, geology, and ability to mitigate impacts. Leases that expire in the area identified as closed to fluid mineral leasing would not be considered for subsequent lease offerings. A portion along the perimeter of the area identified as closed to future oil and gas leasing (Figure A17-2, Appendix 17) would be considered for leasing with an NSO stipulation.*

OHV Use. OHV use would be limited to designated roads and trails.

VRM. The area would be managed as a VRM Class III area.

2.7.9 Air Resources Management

Management Objective—The planning area would be managed to maintain and, where possible, enhance present air quality levels and, within the scope of BLM's authority, minimize emissions that may add to acid rain, cause violations of air quality standards, or reduce visibility.

FLPMA states that, "The public lands [should] be managed in a manner that will protect the quality of scientific, scenic, historical, ecological, environmental, air and atmospheric, water resource, and archaeological values." NEPA indicates that any proposed federal action should comply with other existing environmental laws, regulations, and standards (Section 104 [42 USC 4334]). This would include the Clean Air Act. In particular, the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 indicate that federal actions should comply with state and local as well as federal laws, regulations, and standards. Management actions for air resources management in the planning area would be implemented consistent with the land use decisions of the Green River RMP (Appendix 2).

Table 2-1. Summary Comparison of Alternatives

MANAGEMENT ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL RESOURCE OR LAND USE PROGRAMS				
No Action Alternative	**Alternative 1**	**Alternative 2**	**Alternative 3**	**Proposed JMH CAP**
Monitoring Plan: An interdisciplinary monitoring plan would be developed to evaluate the overall effectiveness of implementing the management decisions for the planning area.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	*An implementation, monitoring, and evaluation process, including an interdisciplinary monitoring plan, would be used to evaluate the overall effectiveness of implementing the management decisions for the planning area and used as a basis for making management adjustments.*
No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	The primary aspects of the process are an implementation strategy for the process, a monitoring plan, and a list of 12 sensitive resources and uses to help determine what, where, under what conditions, and when areas should be open to surface disturbing or disruptive activities. See Appendix 17 for a detailed description of the management strategy to be employed.
No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	Other detailed aspects of the implementation, monitoring, and evaluation process include the following: • Upon completion of the JMH CAP, portions of crucial habitats and other areas of sensitive or important resources would be open to further consideration for various multiple use activities, so long as crucial habitats and other sensitive or important resources would be protected from irreversible adverse effects. This would be accomplished through an implementation strategy that

MANAGEMENT ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL RESOURCE OR LAND USE PROGRAMS				
No Action Alternative	**Alternative 1**	**Alternative 2**	**Alternative 3**	**Proposed JMH CAP**
				would include case-by-case review of all proposals, including use of a 12-point review criteria, application of mitigation measures to protect sensitive resources, and where applicable, controlled location and timing of the various activities and related reclamation in these areas. • Portions of the JMH CAP planning area would be closed to long-term surface disturbing and disruptive activities, rights-of-way (ROW), fencing, power lines, pipelines, long-term and permanent structures or facilities, mineral leasing, mineral exploration and development activities, rangeland improvements, land treatments, and long-term and permanent land and resource use commitments or allocations, if they would result in irreversible adverse effects. This would be done to satisfy needs for adequate wildlife habitat and use of that habitat (crucial winter range, calving/fawning, migration corridors, etc.), watershed protection, protection of other sensitive resources, and for public health and safety. These portions of the JMH CAP planning area are identified as no surface occupancy (NSO) areas in Table 4-8 and Map 50. • Additionally, in portions of Steamboat Mountain ACEC, Greater Sand Dunes ACEC, the

MANAGEMENT ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL RESOURCE OR LAND USE PROGRAMS				
No Action Alternative	**Alternative 1**	**Alternative 2**	**Alternative 3**	**Proposed JMH CAP**
				White Mountain and Split Rock areas, and the core and connectivity areas, surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be subject to extensive review and mitigation that would allow appropriate levels of activity while meeting objectives and safeguarding sensitive resources in the area. Monitoring and evaluation would determine the effectiveness of the management prescriptions and mitigation measures. Adjustments could be made to ensure further activity would not cause fragmentation and abandonment of habitat, and would still meet stated management objectives, safeguard sensitive resources, and not result in irreversible adverse effects. This determination would be based on the effects on elk and their movement patterns, elk use of habitat, effects on other wildlife species and habitats, public health and safety, watershed condition, and effects on other sensitive resources. • Portions of the planning area would be closed to oil and gas leasing and development activities (Map 54). Other surface disturbing and disruptive activities in these portions of the planning area would be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. Surface disturbing and disruptive activities, such as ROWs,

MANAGEMENT ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL RESOURCE OR LAND USE PROGRAMS				
No Action Alternative	**Alternative 1**	**Alternative 2**	**Alternative 3**	**Proposed JMH CAP**
				fencing, power lines, pipelines, long-term and permanent structures or facilities, rangeland improvements, land treatments, and long-term and permanent land and resource use commitments or allocations, may be allowed if they would not result in irreversible adverse effects. Existing oil and gas leases in this portion of the planning area would be recognized, and exploration and development activities on these existing leases would be allowed as appropriate based on site-specific analysis. Intensive mitigation, such as transportation planning; remote control of fluid mineral production facilities to limit travel; multiple-well pads to limit surface disturbances; limiting the number of pads per section in sensitive areas; use of directional drilling to minimize disturbance of sensitive areas; clustering or central location of ancillary facilities; shrub reclamation (containerized stock, transplanting, etc.) to restore, rehabilitate, or replace habitat; application of geotechnical material for construction; and potential unitization prior to exploration and development, may be required. Other resource projects or proposals could expect a similar in-depth consideration and may require similar mitigation measures (Table 2-2 and Appendix 17).

MANAGEMENT ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL RESOURCE OR LAND USE PROGRAMS				
No Action Alternative	**Alternative 1**	**Alternative 2**	**Alternative 3**	**Proposed JMH CAP**
				• Monitoring and evaluation would incorporate information from the elk study conducted in the JMH CAP planning area (see Section 3.1.6.1.3), application of the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management, proper functioning condition (PFC) determinations for riparian areas, and observations of impacts of activities and uses inside and outside the planning area. Appropriate mitigation would be applied to meet planning area management objectives. If it is determined that planning area management objectives are not being met, management would be adapted to address this situation.
Site-specific monitoring plans would be developed for project proposals. No similar action	Same as No Action Alternative No similar action	Same as No Action Alternative No similar action	Same as No Action Alternative Resource indicators, developed as part of an interdisciplinary monitoring plan, would be used for determining effects of all activities on sensitive resources, with emphasis on wildlife and wildlife habitat.	Same as No Action Alternative: Site-specific monitoring plans would be developed for project proposals. Resource indicators, developed as part of the planning area management strategy of the implementation, monitoring, and evaluation process, would be used for determining effects of all activities on all resource values.

MANAGEMENT ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL RESOURCE OR LAND USE PROGRAMS				
No Action Alternative	**Alternative 1**	**Alternative 2**	**Alternative 3**	**Proposed JMH CAP**
No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	Consideration would be given to such factors as weather, disease, drought, hunting pressure, introduction of non-native species, and recreation activities.	Same as Alternative 3: Consideration would be given to such factors as weather, disease, drought, hunting pressure, introduction of non-native species, and recreation activities, as part of the implementation, monitoring, and evaluation process.
No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	Monitoring data would be assessed, and response actions would be determined by an interdisciplinary BLM team (with input from stakeholders and other public entities).	Same as Alternative 3: Monitoring data would be assessed and, response actions would be determined by an interdisciplinary BLM team, with input from stakeholders and other public entities, as part of the implementation, monitoring, and evaluation process.
No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	Timing and sequencing for approving all actions and use authorizations would be imposed if indicators showed unacceptable effects on sensitive resources.	Timing and sequencing for approving all actions and use authorizations would be applied where feasible, but could be excepted if indicators showed effects on resources were within acceptable limits.

LAND AND WATER RESOURCES MANAGEMENT
Management Objective: To maintain or enhance land and water resources using ecological principles and science-based performance criteria

Management Actions for Land and Water Resources				
No Action Alternative	**Alternative 1**	**Alternative 2**	**Alternative 3**	**Proposed JMH CAP**
Healthy Rangelands: The Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands would direct on-the-ground management of public lands and would serve to focus the ongoing development and implementation of activity plans toward the maintenance or the attainment of healthy rangelands.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: The Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands would direct on-the-ground management of public lands and would serve to focus the ongoing development and implementation of activity plans toward the maintenance or the attainment of healthy rangelands.
Proper Functioning Condition: All riparian areas would be assessed to determine existing condition. Riparian habitat in PFC is the minimum acceptable level of ecological condition. Riparian areas would be maintained, improved, or restored to enhance forage conditions, provide wildlife habitat, and improve stream and water quality. Site-specific activity and implementation plans to reduce erosion and sediment yield, promote ground cover, and enhance water quality would be prepared for areas where needed.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: All riparian areas would be assessed to determine existing condition. Riparian habitat in PFC is the minimum acceptable level of ecological condition. Riparian areas would be maintained, improved, or restored to enhance forage conditions, provide wildlife habitat, and improve stream and water quality. Site-specific activity and implementation plans to reduce erosion and sediment yield, promote ground cover, and enhance water quality would be prepared for areas where needed.

Management Actions for Land and Water Resources				
No Action Alternative	**Alternative 1**	**Alternative 2**	**Alternative 3**	**Proposed JMH CAP**
Desired Plant Community: Desired plant community objectives for upland and riparian areas would be established for the planning area through individual site-specific activity and implementation planning, and as updated ecological site inventory data became available.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Desired plant community objectives for upland and riparian areas would be established for the planning area through individual site-specific activity and implementation planning, and as updated ecological site inventory data became available.
Desired plant community objectives would focus on native plant communities.	Desired plant community objectives would emphasize commodity uses while complying with existing regulations pertaining to sensitive resources.	Desired plant community objectives would emphasize wildlife habitat, watershed, and biodiversity values. Particular emphasis would be placed on maintaining or enhancing habitat for special status species.	Desired plant community objectives would emphasize wildlife habitat, livestock grazing, watershed, and biodiversity values while maintaining or enhancing habitat for special status species.	Same as Alternative 3: Desired plant community objectives would emphasize wildlife habitat, livestock grazing, watershed, and biodiversity values while maintaining or enhancing habitat for special status species.
Vegetation Treatments: Vegetation treatments and methods would be considered on a case-by-case basis.	Same as No Action Alternative	Vegetation treatments and methods would be considered on a case-by-case basis, but limited to noxious weed control.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Vegetation treatments and methods would be considered on a case-by-case basis.
Vegetation treatments would be designed to protect water quality, dissipate erosion, and conform to requirements to protect special status plant species.	No similar Action	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	*Vegetation treatments would be used to abate, alter, or transform vegetation communities in an effort to achieve desired plant community objectives, protect water quality, dissipate erosion, and conform to requirements to protect or enhance special status plant and/or wildlife species and associated habitats (Appendix 6).*

Management Actions for Land and Water Resources				
No Action Alternative	**Alternative 1**	**Alternative 2**	**Alternative 3**	**Proposed JMH CAP**
Prescribed burns would be the preferred method of vegetation treatments to convert stands of brush to grasslands and to promote regeneration of aspen stands and/or shrub species.	All methods of vegetation treatments would be considered on a case-by-case basis without preference.	Prescribed burns would not be considered.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Prescribed burns would be the preferred method of vegetation treatments to convert stands of brush to grasslands and to promote regeneration of aspen stands and/or shrub species.
No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	Treatments in aspen communities would be fenced on a case-by-case basis.	Same as Alternative 3: Treatments in aspen communities would be fenced on a case-by-case basis.
Low intensity burns during periods of high soil moisture would be the preferred method and timing in mountain shrub communities.	No similar action	No similar action	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Low intensity burns during periods of high soil moisture would be the preferred method and timing in mountain shrub communities.
Prescribed burns would be restricted or prohibited in areas with coal or other fossil fuel surface outcrops.	No similar action	No similar action	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Prescribed burns would be restricted or prohibited in areas with coal or other fossil fuel surface outcrops.
Prescribed burns would generally be conducted in areas having greater than 35 percent sagebrush composition, 20 percent desirable grass composition, and greater than 10 inches of precipitation.	No similar action	No similar action	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Prescribed burns would generally be conducted in areas having greater than 35 percent sagebrush composition, 20 percent desirable grass composition, and greater than 10 inches of precipitation.
All vegetation treatments should be designed to be irregular in shape for edge effect, cover, and visual aesthetics.	No similar action	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: All vegetation treatments should be designed to be irregular in shape for edge effect, cover, and visual aesthetics.

Management Actions for Land and Water Resources				
No Action Alternative	**Alternative 1**	**Alternative 2**	**Alternative 3**	**Proposed JMH CAP**
Areas treated with prescribed burns would be rested a minimum of two full growing seasons after treatment and fenced from livestock and big game animals if necessary.	No similar action	Same as No Action Alternative	Areas proposed for treatment with prescribed burns would be rested 1 full year prior to treatment (unless vegetation cover prior to treatment had adequate fine fuels to carry the fire) and would be rested 24 months after treatment.	Areas proposed for treatment with prescribed burns would be rested 1 full year prior to treatment (unless vegetation cover prior to treatment had adequate fine fuels to carry the fire) and would be rested 24 months after treatment, unless an onsite analysis determined this time frame should be expanded or reduced.
Herbicide loading sites would be prohibited within 500 feet of water sources, floodplains, riparian areas, and special status plant locations, and would be used in accordance with the guidelines in Appendix 8, Standard Operating Procedures for Range Improvements and Vegetation Manipulations.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Herbicide loading sites would be prohibited within 500 feet of water sources, floodplains, riparian areas, and special status plant locations, and would be used in accordance with the guidelines in Appendix 8, Standard Operating Procedures for Range Improvements and Vegetation Manipulations.
Fences: Where documented wildlife conflicts with fencing on public lands occurred, fences would be modified, reconstructed, or if necessary, removed.	Fences on public lands would be modified or reconstructed where documented wildlife conflicts with fencing occurred.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Where documented wildlife conflicts with fencing on public lands occurred, fences would be modified, reconstructed, or if necessary, removed.
Herding control of livestock would be encouraged as an alternative to fencing.	No similar action	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Herding control of livestock would be considered as an alternative to fencing.
Fence construction would be in accordance with BLM design standards and located so as not to overly impede wildlife or wild horse movement.	Fence construction would be in accordance with BLM design standards with no special consideration for location.	Fence construction would be in accordance with BLM design standards and located so as not to overly impede wildlife.	Same as No Action Alternative	Fence construction would be in accordance with BLM design standards and located so as not to overly impede wildlife movement. Consideration would also be given to wild horse movement and to special status species.

Management Actions for Land and Water Resources				
No Action Alternative	**Alternative 1**	**Alternative 2**	**Alternative 3**	**Proposed JMH CAP**
No similar action	No similar action	Fencing would be used to limit wild horses to the modified boundary of the Divide Basin Herd Management Area (which excludes the JMH CAP planning area).	No similar action	No similar action
Watershed Health Assessments: Assessments of watershed health would be initiated based on levels of development, rangeland standards, PFC, and other available data. Those watersheds with more sensitive baseline conditions would be the focus for increased monitoring efforts and mitigation (Appendix 5).	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Assessments of watershed health would be initiated based on levels of development, rangeland standards, PFC, and other available data. Those watersheds with more sensitive baseline conditions would be the focus for increased monitoring efforts and mitigation (Appendix 5).
Native Vegetation: Native vegetation would be managed to allow natural plant succession to continue, with emphasis on mountain shrub, basin big sagebrush/lemon scurfpea, aspen, and other unique or important vegetation types.	No similar action.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Native vegetation would be managed to allow natural plant succession to continue, with emphasis on mountain shrub, basin big sagebrush/lemon scurfpea, aspen, and other unique or important vegetation types.

Fire Management				
Management Objective: To use prescribed fire as a management tool to help meet multiple use resource management goals; and to provide cost-effective protection from wildfire to life, property, and resource values				
No Action Alternative	**Alternative 1**	**Alternative 2**	**Alternative 3**	**Proposed JMH CAP**
Fire Management Implementation Plan: Fire prescriptions identified in the Fire Management Implementation Plan for BLM-Administered Public Lands in the State of Wyoming would be implemented. The plan would be reviewed and updated as necessary to be consistent with federal wildland fire policy and the National Fire Plan.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Fire prescriptions identified in the Fire Management Implementation Plan for BLM-Administered Public Lands in the State of Wyoming would be implemented. The plan would be reviewed and updated as necessary to be consistent with federal wildland fire policy and the National Fire Plan.
Wildland and Prescribed Fire: Wildland and prescribed fires would be managed in all vegetation types to maintain or improve biological diversity and the overall health of the public lands.	Same as No Action Alternative	Prescribed burns would not be considered. Wildland fire would be managed within and outside prescription areas to improve biological diversity and the overall health of the public lands.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Wildland and prescribed fires would be managed in all vegetation types to maintain or improve biological diversity and the overall health of the public lands.
Fire Suppression: Full fire suppression would be applied for basin big sagebrush/lemon scurfpea vegetation associations.	Same as No Action Alternative	Limited fire suppression would be applied for basin big sagebrush/lemon scurfpea vegetation associations.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Full fire suppression would be applied for basin big sagebrush/lemon scurfpea vegetation associations.

Water Resources Management
Management Objective: To stabilize and conserve soils; increase vegetative production; maintain or improve surface and groundwater quality; and to protect, maintain, or improve wetlands, floodplains, and riparian areas

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Water Quality: Land uses and surface disturbing activities would be designed to reduce erosion and to maintain or improve water quality.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Land uses and surface disturbing activities would be designed to reduce erosion and to maintain or improve water quality.
The area within 500 feet of wetlands, riparian areas, and 100-year floodplains, and within 100 feet of the edge of the inner gorge of intermittent and large ephemeral drainages would be avoidance areas for surface disturbing activities.	The area within 250 feet of wetlands, riparian areas, and 100-year floodplains, and within 50 feet of the edge of the inner gorge of intermittent and large ephemeral drainages would be avoidance areas for surface disturbing activities.	The area within ¼ mile of wetlands, riparian areas, and 100-year floodplains would be avoidance areas for surface disturbing activities.	The area within 500 feet to ¼ mile of wetlands, riparian areas, and 100-year floodplains would be avoidance areas for surface disturbing activities. The appropriate distance would be determined on a case-by-case basis.	Same as No Action Alternative: The area within 500 feet of wetlands, riparian areas, and 100-year floodplains, and within 100 feet of the edge of the inner gorge of intermittent and large ephemeral drainages would be avoidance areas for surface disturbing activities.
Activities in these areas could be allowed if a site-specific analysis determined that no unacceptable impacts would occur to 100-year floodplains, wetlands, riparian areas, or water quality, and a plan to mitigate impacts to water quality were approved.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Activities in these areas could be allowed if a site-specific analysis determined that no adverse impacts would occur to 100-year floodplains, wetlands, riparian areas, or water quality, and a plan to mitigate impacts to water quality were approved.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Permanent Facilities: The 100-year floodplains, wetlands, and riparian areas would be closed to new permanent facilities (e.g., storage tanks, structure pits, etc.).	New permanent facilities would be allowed in floodplains provided there were no practicable alternatives (Executive Order (EO) 11988), and appropriate mitigation measures would be implemented.	Same as No Action Alternative	New permanent facilities that would enhance the protection and management of 100-year floodplains, wetlands, and riparian areas would be considered.	Same as Alternative 3: *New permanent facilities that would enhance the protection and management of 100-year floodplains, wetlands, and riparian areas would be considered.*
Proposals for linear crossings in 100-year floodplains, wetlands, and riparian areas would be considered on a case-by-case basis.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Proposals for linear crossings in 100-year floodplains, wetlands, and riparian areas would be considered on a case-by-case basis.
Erosion Control: Areas with highly erodible soils would be avoidance areas for surface disturbing activities unless site-specific analysis determined that soil degradation would not occur and that water quality would not be adversely affected.	Same as No Action Alternative	Surface disturbing activities would be prohibited in areas of highly erodible soils or that would be difficult to reclaim.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Areas with highly erodible soils would be avoidance areas for surface disturbing activities unless site-specific analysis determined that soil degradation would not occur and that water quality would not be adversely affected.
When applicable, erosion control plans would be required as part of surface disturbing project proposals.	Same as No Action Alternative	No Similar Action	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: When applicable, erosion control plans would be required as part of surface disturbing project proposals.
Colorado River Salinity Control: BLM would participate with federal, state, and local government agencies to develop and implement salinity control plans for the Colorado River Basin.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: BLM would participate with federal, state, and local government agencies to develop and implement salinity control plans for the Colorado River Basin.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Wetlands and Floodplains: Wetlands and floodplains would be managed in accordance with EO 11988, EO 11990, and Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Wetlands and floodplains would be managed in accordance with EO 11988, EO 11990, and Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.
Projects to improve the ecological integrity of the dunal ponds would be considered for development on BLM-administered public lands.	Same as No Action Alternative	Specific actions would be implemented to protect the ecological integrity of the dunal ponds and other ecologically important ephemeral wetlands not covered under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.	Same as Alternative 2	Same as No Action Alternative: Projects to improve the ecological integrity of the dunal ponds would be considered for development on BLM-administered public lands.
Riparian Management Exclosures: Existing riparian management exclosures would be maintained or modified, and new exclosures would be developed for enhancement of wildlife habitat.	Existing exclosures could be removed and the area made available for livestock grazing; new exclosures would be considered only if they would benefit commodity uses.	Existing exclosures would be maintained, and new exclosures would be considered only if they would benefit preservation of sensitive resources.	Same as No Action Alternative	Existing riparian management exclosures could be maintained and/or modified based on site-specific analysis. Where site-specific analysis determined they no longer served their purpose, they could also be removed. New exclosures could be developed if they would benefit resources.
Exclosures would be closed to livestock grazing.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Exclosures would be closed to livestock grazing.
Fluid Mineral Wells: Water wells constructed to provide water for drilling of fluid mineral wells (oil, gas, or coalbed gas wells) would be constructed in compliance with BLM regulations for resource protection (43 CFR 3162.5).	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Water wells constructed to provide water for drilling of fluid mineral wells (oil, gas, or coalbed gas wells) would be constructed in compliance with BLM regulations for resource protection (43 CFR 3162.5).

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Hydrogeologic investigations would be required where there was a reasonable expectation that surface water features were in connection with geologic formations being dewatered. Mitigation measures would be implemented, as needed, to protect surface waters. Appropriate measures would be applied to protect groundwater quality and prevent co-mingling of aquifers (Appendix 6).				Hydrogeologic investigations would be required where there was a reasonable expectation that surface water features were in connection with geologic formations being dewatered. Mitigation measures would be implemented, as needed, to protect surface waters. Appropriate measures would be applied to protect groundwater quality and prevent co-mingling of aquifers (Appendix 6).
Aquifer Recharge Areas: Aquifer recharge areas (Map 61) would be managed to maintain or enhance recharge volume and groundwater quality by limiting road density and surface occupancy. No similar action	Aquifer recharge areas (Map 61) would be managed to maintain or enhance recharge volume and groundwater quality by limiting the amount of impermeable surfaces in the recharge areas. No similar action	Same as No Action Alternative Studies would be conducted to better define aquifer recharge area boundaries.	Same as No Action Alternative Studies would be conducted on a case-by-case basis to better define aquifer recharge area boundaries. Studies would be done primarily in relation to specific projects.	Same as No Action Alternative: Aquifer recharge areas (Map 61) would be managed to maintain or enhance recharge volume and groundwater quality by limiting road density and surface occupancy. Same as Alternative 3: Studies would be conducted on a case-by-case basis to better define aquifer recharge area boundaries. Studies would be done primarily in relation to specific projects.

Wild Horses Management
Management Objective: To protect, maintain, and control viable, healthy herds of wild horses in the Divide Basin Herd Management Area (HMA) at Appropriate Management Levels (AML) while retaining their free-roaming nature; provide adequate habitat for free-roaming wild horses through management consistent with principles of multiple use and environmental protection; and provide opportunity for the public to view wild horses

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Wild Horse Herd Management Area Boundaries and Appropriate Management Levels: The Divide Basin Wild Horse HMA boundaries (Map 62) would remain unchanged and the AML would be maintained at 415–600 horses.	Same as No Action Alternative	The Divide Basin Wild Horse HMA boundaries (Map 62) would be modified to exclude the JMH CAP planning area. The AML would be maintained at 415–600 horses.	The Divide Basin Wild Horse HMA boundaries (Map 62) would be expanded to include the entire JMH CAP planning area. The AML would be maintained at 415–600 horses.	Same as No Action Alternative: The Divide Basin Wild Horse HMA boundaries (Map 62) would remain unchanged, and the AML would be maintained at 415–600 horses.
No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	No more than 100 horses of the AML would be allowed in the expansion area.	No similar action
Activity and Monitoring Plans: In conformance with the Green River RMP objectives for vegetation management, a site-specific activity plan would be prepared and implemented for the Divide Basin Wild Horse HMA to ensure adequate forage is available to support the AML of 415–600 horses.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: In conformance with the Green River RMP objectives for vegetation management, a site-specific activity plan would be prepared and implemented for the Divide Basin Wild Horse HMA to ensure adequate forage is available to support the AML of 415–600 horses.
A monitoring program would be developed to support wild horse herd management decisions.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	A monitoring program would be developed to support wild horse herd management decisions.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Water Developments: Water developments would be considered to maintain or improve resource conditions and/or enhance wild horse herd distribution and manage forage utilization.	Same as No Action Alternative	No water developments for wild horse management would be constructed.	Water developments would be provided, as needed, to improve wild horse herd distribution and manage forage utilization.	Same as Alternative 3: Water developments would be provided, as needed, to improve wild horse herd distribution and manage forage utilization.
Water developments would be allowed within sensitive wildlife habitats in conformance with wildlife objectives.	Same as No Action Alternative	No similar action	Water developments within sensitive wildlife habitats would be considered only if wildlife habitat and resource conditions were improved or maintained.	Same as Alternative 3: *Water developments within sensitive wildlife habitats would be considered only if wildlife habitat and resource conditions were improved or maintained.*
Compatibility with special status plant species would be required.	Same as No Action Alternative	No similar action	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Compatibility with special status plant species would be required.
Gathering Plan: A selective gathering plan would be developed and implemented to remove excess horses from inside and outside the HMA to maintain the existing AMLs.	Same as No Action Alternative	A gathering plan would be developed and implemented to remove wild horses from the JMH CAP planning area.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: A selective gathering plan would be developed and implemented to remove excess horses from inside and outside the HMA to maintain the existing AMLs.
Gathering cycles would vary by gathering plan objectives, resource conditions, and needs.	Same as No Action Alternative	No similar action	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Gathering cycles would vary by gathering plan objectives, resource conditions, and needs.
Fertility control would be initiated only if necessary.	Same as No Action Alternative	No similar action	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Fertility control would be initiated only if necessary.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Public Education: Public education and interpretation for the public enjoyment of wild horse herds in the Divide Basin HMA would be provided through interpretive signs and access sites for viewing horses.	Same as No Action Alternative	No similar action	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Public education and interpretation for the public enjoyment of wild horse herds in the Divide Basin HMA would be provided through interpretive signs and access sites for viewing horses.

Livestock Grazing Management
Management Objective: To improve forage production and ecological conditions for the benefit of livestock use while providing for other resource values

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management: The Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management would apply to all livestock grazing activities on public lands (Appendix 10). If livestock grazing were determined to be a factor for any allotment that did not meet the Wyoming BLM Standards for Healthy Rangelands, appropriate actions (as determined by an interdisciplinary BLM team in consultation with stakeholders) would be implemented. The BLM staff would work with livestock operators and interested publics to determine the most appropriate methods for meeting the standards. Significant progress toward meeting the standards would be made within a reasonable time frame (subject to climatic variability and other constraints).	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: The Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management would apply to all livestock grazing activities on public lands (Appendix 10). If livestock grazing were determined to be a factor for any allotment that did not meet the Wyoming BLM Standards for Healthy Rangelands, appropriate actions (as determined by an interdisciplinary BLM team in consultation with stakeholders) would be implemented. The BLM staff would work with livestock operators and interested publics to determine the most appropriate methods for meeting the standards. Significant progress toward meeting the standards would be made within a reasonable time frame (subject to climatic variability and other constraints).

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Rangeland and Riparian Habitat: Appropriate actions for improving degraded rangeland and riparian habitat (i.e., meeting Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands) could include, but would not be limited to, reduction of permitted AUMs, modified turnout dates, livestock water developments, range improvements, modified grazing periods, growing season rest, riparian pastures, exclosures, implementation of forage utilization levels, and livestock conversions.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Appropriate actions for improving degraded rangeland and riparian habitat (i.e., meeting Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands) could include, but would not be limited to, reduction of permitted AUMs, modified turnout dates, livestock water developments, range improvements, modified grazing periods, growing season rest, riparian pastures, exclosures, implementation of forage utilization levels, and livestock conversions.
No similar action	Reductions of active AUMs would not be implemented unless it was the only appropriate action for meeting the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands.	No similar action	No similar action	No similar action
No similar action	No similar action	Modified turnout dates would be the primary method for meeting the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands.	No similar action	No similar action

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Forage Utilization Levels: Forage utilization levels for upland and riparian species would be in accordance with individual allotment management plans. Determination of forage utilization levels would be based on PFC Guidelines, BLM reference handbooks, and professional judgment (Appendix 10).	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Forage utilization levels for upland and riparian species would be in accordance with individual allotment management plans. Determination of forage utilization levels would be based on PFC Guidelines, BLM reference handbooks, and professional judgment (Appendix 10).
Livestock Water Developments and Range Improvements: Livestock water developments and range improvements would be considered to maintain or improve resource conditions and/or enhance livestock distribution.	Livestock water developments and range improvements would be considered to enhance livestock production.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Livestock water developments and range improvements would be considered to maintain or improve resource conditions and/or enhance livestock distribution.
Compatibility with special status plant species would be required.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Compatibility with special status plant species would be required.
No similar action	No similar action	Livestock water developments and range improvements proposed in sensitive wildlife habitat would be considered only if the habitat and resource conditions were improved.	Livestock water developments and/or range improvements proposed in sensitive wildlife habitat would be considered only if the habitat and resource conditions were maintained or improved.	Same as Alternative 3: *Livestock water developments and/or range improvements proposed in sensitive wildlife habitat would be considered only if the habitat and resource conditions were maintained or improved.*

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Salt or Mineral Supplements: Salt or mineral supplements would not be allowed within 500 feet of natural water sources and related riparian habitat and historic and scenic trails unless analysis showed that watershed, riparian, and wildlife values, or the integrity of trails would not be adversely affected.	Salt or mineral supplements would not be allowed within 250 feet of riparian habitat and historic and scenic trails, unless analysis showed that watershed, riparian, and wildlife values, or the integrity of trails would not be adversely affected.	Salt or mineral supplements would not be allowed within 1/2 mile of riparian habitat, historic and scenic trails, areas inhabited by special status plant species, or other sensitive areas.	Salt or mineral supplements would not be allowed within 1/4 mile of riparian habitat, historic and scenic trails, areas inhabited by special status plant species, or other sensitive areas, unless analysis showed that watershed, riparian, and wildlife values, or the integrity of trails would not be adversely affected.	Same as No Action Alternative: Salt or mineral supplements would not be allowed within 500 feet of natural water sources and related riparian habitat and historic and scenic trails unless analysis showed that watershed, riparian, and wildlife values, or the integrity of trails would not be adversely affected.
No salt or mineral supplements would be allowed in areas of special status plant species or other sensitive areas.	Same as No Action Alternative	No similar action	No similar action	Same as No Action Alternative: No salt or mineral supplements would be allowed in areas of special status plant species or other sensitive areas.
No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	*Placement of salt blocks at least 500 feet away from wells, troughs, and other human-made water sources would be encouraged to better distribute livestock.*

Vegetation Management
Management Objective: To maintain or enhance vegetation community health, composition, and diversity to meet watershed, wild horse, wildlife, and livestock grazing resource management objectives; and to provide for plant diversity (desired plant communities)

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Special Status Plant Species: Potential habitat of special status plant species' communities on federal land or on split estate lands would require searches for the plant species prior to approving any project or activity. Should species be found, all disruptive activities would be halted until species-specific protective measures were developed and implemented. For listed species, protective measures would be developed and implemented with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS).	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Potential habitat of special status plant species' communities on federal land or on split estate lands would require searches for the plant species prior to approving any project or activity. Should species be found, all disruptive activities would be halted until species-specific protective measures were developed and implemented. For listed species, protective measures would be developed and implemented with the USFWS.
Special status plant species potential habitat areas would be areas of controlled surface use (CSU) for surface disturbing activities.	Same as No Action Alternative	Surface disturbing activities would be prohibited in special status plant species potential habitat areas.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Special status plant species potential habitat areas would be areas of controlled surface use (CSU) for surface disturbing activities.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Known locations of special status plant species (Map 15) would be protected and closed to— • Surface disturbing activities that could adversely affect the plants or their habitat • Location of new mining claims (withdrawal from mineral location and entry under the land laws would be pursued) • Mineral material sales • All off-road vehicular use, including those vehicles used for geophysical exploration activities, surveying, etc. • Use of explosives and blasting.	Known locations of Wyoming BLM sensitive plant species (Map 15) would be avoidance areas for surface disturbing activities.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Known locations of special status plant species (Map 15) would be protected and closed to— • Surface disturbing activities that could adversely affect the plants or their habitat • Location of new mining claims (withdrawal from mineral location and entry under the land laws would be pursued) • Mineral material sales • All off-road vehicular use, including those vehicles used for geophysical exploration activities, surveying, etc. • Use of explosives and blasting.
Known locations of special status plant species would be open to consideration for mineral leasing with no surface occupancy requirements.	No similar action	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Known locations of special status plant species would be open to consideration for mineral leasing with no surface occupancy requirements.
Locations of federally listed, proposed, or candidate species would be avoided or closed to surface disturbing activities depending on coordination with the USFWS.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Locations of federally listed, proposed, or candidate species would be avoided or closed to surface disturbing activities depending on coordination with the USFWS.
Rights-of-Way Limitations: Areas where Wyoming BLM sensitive plant species are known to exist, and/or have potential habitat, would be ROW avoidance areas (Map 8).	Same as No Action Alternative	Actual plant locations, and/or potential habitat, of Wyoming BLM sensitive plant species would be ROW exclusion areas (Map 27).	Same as Alternative 2	Same as No Action Alternative: Areas where Wyoming BLM sensitive plant species are known to exist, and/or have potential habitat, would be ROW avoidance areas (Map 49).

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Exceptions could be granted by the Authorized Officer if analysis showed that there was no adverse impact to the plant populations.	Same as No Action Alternative	Exceptions would not be considered.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Exceptions could be granted by the Authorized Officer if analysis showed that there was no adverse impact to the plant populations.
Fire Suppression: Fire suppression vehicular activities would be limited to existing roads and trails in special status plant species habitat (Map 15). A site-specific analysis would be prepared for all fire management activities around special status plant species sites to determine the appropriate fire management response.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Fire suppression vehicular activities would be limited to existing roads and trails in special status plant species habitat (Map 15). A site-specific analysis would be prepared for all fire management activities around special status plant species sites to determine the appropriate fire management response.
Threatened and Endangered Plant Species: Potential habitat for listed, proposed, or candidate threatened and endangered plant species would be surveyed prior to any surface disturbance or depletion of surface water sources. If any listed plant species were identified, formal consultation with the USFWS would occur, and management prescriptions would be developed on a case-by-case basis.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Potential habitat for listed, proposed, or candidate threatened and endangered plant species would be surveyed prior to any surface disturbance or depletion of surface water sources. If any listed plant species were identified, formal consultation with the USFWS would occur, and management prescriptions would be developed on a case-by-case basis.
Invasive Species: EO 13112 regarding invasive species would be followed.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: EO 13112 regarding invasive species would be followed.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
The introduction of invasive species would be prevented and monitored, and populations would be controlled in a cost-effective and environmentally sound manner. Public education on invasive species and their control would be promoted. All surface disturbing activities would be subject to best management practices (Appendix 6) that would eliminate or severely reduce the potential for introducing invasive species.				The introduction of invasive species would be prevented and monitored, and populations would be controlled in a cost-effective and environmentally sound manner. Public education on invasive species and their control would be promoted. All surface disturbing activities would be subject to best management practices (Appendix 6) that would eliminate or severely reduce the potential for introducing invasive species.
Forest and Woodland Health: Management of conifer and aspen communities would be designed to promote forest and woodland health. Old decadent trees may be left standing or downed to provide cover or other habitat for wildlife (e.g., Animal Inn).	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Management of conifer and aspen communities would be designed to promote forest and woodland health. Old decadent trees may be left standing or downed to provide cover or other habitat for wildlife (e.g., Animal Inn).

Wildlife Habitat Management
Management Objective: To maintain, improve, or enhance the biological diversity of wildlife species while ensuring healthy ecosystems; restore disturbed or altered habitat, with the objective of attaining desired native plant communities, while providing for wildlife needs and soil stability; and to the extent possible, provide suitable wildlife habitat and forage to support the Wyoming Game and Fish Department (WGFD) strategic plan population objectives

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Habitat Management Plan: Habitat management plans would be developed, as needed, for sensitive and/or highly developed and disturbed areas to mitigate wildlife habitat losses.	Same as No Action Alternative	A Habitat Management Plan would be prepared for the entire planning area to mitigate wildlife habitat losses.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Habitat management plans would be developed, as needed, for highly developed and disturbed areas to mitigate wildlife habitat losses.
Habitat management plans would include habitat expansion efforts, threatened and endangered species reintroduction, and population goals and objectives.	Same as No Action Alternative	The habitat management plan would include habitat expansion efforts, threatened and endangered species reintroduction, and population goals and objectives.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Habitat management plans would include habitat expansion efforts, threatened and endangered species reintroduction, and population goals and objectives.
To the extent possible, suitable wildlife habitat and forage would be provided to support the WGFD Strategic Plan objectives.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: To the extent possible, suitable wildlife habitat and forage would be provided to support the WGFD Strategic Plan objectives.
Changes in the WGFD planning objective levels would be considered based on habitat capability, availability, and site-specific analysis.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Changes in the WGFD planning objective levels would be considered based on habitat capability, availability, and site-specific analysis.
Water Developments: Wildlife water developments would be considered on a case-by-case basis to maintain or improve wildlife habitat and resource conditions.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Wildlife water developments would be considered on a case-by-case basis to maintain or improve wildlife habitat and resource conditions.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Special Status Wildlife Species: Potential habitat of special status wildlife species on federal land or on split estate lands would require searches for the species prior to approving any project or activity.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Potential habitat of special status wildlife species on federal land or on split estate lands would require searches for the species prior to approving any project or activity.
Should species be found, all disruptive activities would be halted until species-specific protective measures could be implemented.	Only locations of federally listed, proposed, or candidate species would require species-specific protection measures as developed with the USFWS.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Should species be found, all disruptive activities would be halted until species-specific protective measures developed with the USFWS could be implemented.
Special status species' habitat would be protected from degradation, and BLM would take proactive measures to improve habitat character on an as needed basis, in accordance with BLM 6840 policy and Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Special Status Species' habitat would be protected from degradation and BLM would take proactive measures to improve habitat character on an as needed basis, in accordance with BLM 6840 policy and Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Sensitive Habitat: Crucial winter range or sensitive habitats, birthing areas, the connectivity area (migration corridor), nesting sites, and sensitive fisheries habitats would be maintained or improved. This would be accomplished by maintaining habitat or reducing habitat loss or alteration, improving habitat where possible, and by applying appropriate mitigation requirements (e.g., distance and seasonal limitations, rehabilitation) to all appropriate activities. Exceptions could be provided on a case-by-case basis should exception criteria (Appendix 4) be met. Mitigation requirements would be determined on a case-by-case basis.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Crucial winter range or sensitive habitats, birthing areas, the connectivity area (migration corridor), nesting sites, and sensitive fisheries habitats would be maintained or improved. This would be accomplished by maintaining habitat or reducing habitat loss or alteration, improving habitat where possible, and by applying appropriate mitigation requirements (e.g., distance and seasonal limitations, rehabilitation) to all appropriate activities. Exceptions could be provided on a case-by-case basis should exception criteria (Appendix 4) be met. Mitigation requirements would be determined on a case-by-case basis.
Predator Damage Control: The BLM would continue to coordinate with APHIS–Wildlife Services (WS) and review its annual management plan for animal damage control activities on public lands.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: The BLM would continue to coordinate with APHIS-Wildlife Services (WS) and review its annual management plan for animal damage control activities on public lands.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Proposed animal damage control activities not compatible with BLM planning and management prescriptions or objectives for other resource activities and uses would be identified on a case-by-case basis. APHIS-WS would be requested to amend or adjust the plan accordingly.	Same as No Action Alternative	Proposed animal damage control activities not compatible with BLM planning and management prescriptions or objectives for other resource activities and uses would be identified on a case-by-case basis. BLM would determine appropriate planning strategies, with input from APHIS-WS.	Same as Alternative 2	Same as Alternative 2: *Proposed animal damage control activities not compatible with BLM planning and management prescriptions or objectives for other resource activities and uses would be identified on a case-by-case basis. BLM would determine appropriate planning strategies, with input from APHIS-WS.*
APHIS-WS would determine the appropriate animal damage control methods in coordination with BLM.	Same as No Action Alternative	Non-lethal animal damage control for livestock protection would be allowed. Lethal animal damage control would be allowed only if it would benefit wildlife.	Non-lethal control would be emphasized but lethal methods would be allowed for animal damage control for both livestock and wildlife.	Emphasis would be placed on non-lethal methods. Control techniques and methods would be discussed at an annual meeting.
No similar action	No similar action	The JMH CAP planning area would be designated as a "Restricted Control Area" for predator control in coordination with APHIS-WS.	Same as Alternative 2	Same as Alternative 2: *The JMH CAP planning area would be designated as a "Restricted Control Area" for predator control in coordination with APHIS-WS.*
Greater Sage-Grouse Leks, Nesting and Early Brood-rearing Habitat: Surface occupancy (long-term or permanent aboveground facilities) would be controlled within ¼ mile of greater sage-grouse leks (Map 7).	Same as No Action Alternative	No similar action	Surface occupancy (long-term or permanent aboveground facilities) would be prohibited within ½ mile of greater sage-grouse leks (Map 39).	*Surface occupancy (long-term or permanent aboveground facilities) would be controlled near (usually within ¼ mile) greater sage-grouse leks (Map 50) unless adverse impacts could be mitigated. Distances would be subject to change on a case-by-case basis depending on applicable scientific research and site-specific analysis.*

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
No similar action	No similar action	Surface occupancy (long-term or permanent aboveground facilities) would be prohibited in greater sage-grouse concentration areas (Map 28).	No similar action	No similar action
Disruptive activities would avoid occupied greater sage-grouse leks from 8:00 p.m. to 8:00 a.m. daily.	Same as No Action Alternative	No similar action	No similar action	Same as No Action Alternative: Disruptive activities would avoid occupied greater sage-grouse leks from 8:00 p.m. to 8:00 a.m. daily.
No similar action	No similar action	Disruptive activities would avoid occupied greater sage-grouse leks and concentration areas 24 hours daily.	No similar action	No similar action
No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	Disruptive activities would avoid occupied greater sage-grouse leks and within ½ mile of nesting/brood-rearing areas from sunset to 9:00 a.m. daily.	No similar action
Disruptive activities would avoid occupied greater sage-grouse leks from, usually, February 1 through June 30. The actual area to be avoided, usually within ¼ to ½ mile of the lek, and appropriate seasonal limitations would be determined on a case-by-case basis.	No similar action	No similar action	Disruptive activities would avoid occupied greater sage-grouse leks from, usually, March 1 through May 15. The actual area to be avoided, usually within ¼ to ½ mile of the lek, and appropriate seasonal limitations would be determined on a case-by-case basis.	Disruptive activities would avoid occupied greater sage-grouse leks, from, usually, March 1 through May 15. The actual area to be avoided and appropriate time frame would be determined on a case-by-case basis depending on applicable scientific research and site-specific analysis.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
No similar action	Seasonal limitations for disruptive activities would be determined on a case-by-case basis.	No similar action	No similar action	No similar action
Seasonal limitations on surface disturbing and disruptive activities (usually from February 1 through July 31) would apply up to 2 miles from greater sage-grouse leks (nesting and early brood-rearing habitat) on a case-by-case basis (Map 7).	Seasonal limitations on surface disturbing and disruptive activities (usually from March 15 through July 15) would apply within actual nesting and early brood-rearing habitat up to 1 mile from greater sage-grouse leks on a case-by-case basis (Map 16).	No similar action	Seasonal limitations on surface disturbing and disruptive activities (usually from March 15 through July 15) would apply within actual nesting and early brood-rearing habitat up to 2 miles from greater sage-grouse leks on a case-by-case basis (Map 39).	*Seasonal limitations on surface disturbing and disruptive activities (usually from March 15 through July 15) would apply in nesting and early brood-rearing habitat on a case-by-case basis (Map 50).*
Nesting and early brood-rearing habitats would be protected from habitat degradation, and measures would be taken to improve habitat quality within 2 miles of greater sage-grouse leks on an as needed basis.	Nesting and early brood-rearing habitats would be protected from habitat degradation, and measures would be taken to improve habitat quality within 1 mile of greater sage-grouse leks on an as needed basis.	Nesting and early brood-rearing habitats would be protected from habitat degradation, and measures would be taken to improve habitat quality within greater sage-grouse concentration areas on an as needed basis.	Nesting and early brood-rearing habitats would be protected from habitat degradation, and measures would be taken to improve habitat quality within 2 miles of greater sage-grouse leks on an as needed basis.	*Nesting and early brood-rearing habitats would be protected from habitat degradation, and measures would be taken to improve habitat quality within the areas identified on Map 50, on an as needed basis.*
Greater Sage-Grouse Winter Concentration Areas: Disruptive activities would be prohibited in greater sage-grouse winter concentration areas from November 15 through April 30.	No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	No similar action
Greater Sage-Grouse Winter Range: No similar action	No similar action	Surface occupancy (long-term or permanent aboveground facilities) would be prohibited in greater sage-grouse winter range (Map 28).	No similar action	No similar action

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	Disruptive activities would be prohibited in greater sage-grouse winter range usually from November 15 through March 15 (Map 39). These areas are subject to change based on new data and scientific information.	Same as Alternative 3: *Disruptive activities would be prohibited in greater sage-grouse winter range usually from November 15 through March 15 (Map 50). These areas are subject to change based on new data and scientific information.*
All Greater Sage-Grouse Habitats (Leks, Nesting, Early Brood-Rearing, and Winter Range): Seasonal limitations may be excepted, provided criteria in the Procedures for Processing Proposals for Land Use Authorizations in Areas of Seasonal Restriction (Appendix 4) can be met, and appropriate mitigation can be implemented (Appendix 6), as determined by BLM in coordination with commodity users and other appropriate entities.	No similar action	No similar action	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Seasonal limitations may be excepted, provided criteria in the Procedures for Processing Proposals for Land Use Authorizations in Areas of Seasonal Restriction (Appendix 4) can be met, and appropriate mitigation can be implemented (Appendix 6), as determined by BLM in coordination with commodity users and other appropriate entities.
Avoidance areas may vary depending on natural topographic barriers, terrain, vegetation structure and cover, type of activity, line of sight distance, habitat needs, etc.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Avoidance areas may vary depending on natural topographic barriers, terrain, vegetation structure and cover, type of activity, line of sight distance, habitat needs, etc.
Greater sage-grouse habitats would be protected from habitat degradation, and measures would be taken to improve habitat on an as needed basis in accordance with BLM 6840 policy.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Greater sage-grouse habitats would be protected from habitat degradation, and measures would be taken to improve habitat on an as needed basis in accordance with BLM 6840 policy.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	*The management practices in greater sage-grouse habitats would be designed to limit direct loss of habitat and to prevent habitat degradation. Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would avoid these habitats.*
No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	Mitigation of adverse effects (e.g., noise, traffic) on all habitats would be determined and applied on a case-by-case basis.
Maintenance and Operational Activities in Greater Sage-Grouse Habitats: No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	In greater sage-grouse habitats, surface disturbing maintenance and operational activities would require mitigation measures or development plans. These mitigation measures or development plans would be based on local situations on a case-by-case basis.	Same as Alternative 3: *In greater sage-grouse habitats, surface disturbing maintenance and operational activities would require mitigation measures or development plans. These mitigation measures or development plans would be based on local situations on a case-by-case basis.*

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Big Game Winter Range: Disruptive activities would be prohibited in big game (elk, deer, and antelope) crucial winter range between November 15 and April 30 (Map 7).	No similar action	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Disruptive activities would be prohibited in big game (elk, deer, and antelope) crucial winter range between November 15 and April 30 (Map 51).
Seasonal limitations may be excepted, provided criteria in the Procedures for Processing Applications in Areas of Seasonal Restriction (Appendix 4) can be met and appropriate mitigation can be implemented (as determined by BLM in coordination with commodity users).	No similar action	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Seasonal limitations may be excepted, provided criteria in the Procedures for Processing Applications in Areas of Seasonal Restriction (Appendix 4) can be met and appropriate mitigation can be implemented (as determined by BLM in coordination with commodity users).
No similar action	No similar action	Vegetative character of big game (elk, deer, and antelope) crucial winter range would be restored on a case-by-case basis using BLM reclamation and monitoring practices (Appendix 9).	No similar action	No similar action
Big Game Birthing Areas: Surface disturbing and disruptive activities and the amount of habitat disturbed would be limited in big game birthing areas from May 1 through June 30.	No similar action	Surface disturbing activities would be prohibited in big game birthing areas.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as the No Action Alternative: Surface disturbing and disruptive activities and the amount of habitat disturbed would be limited in big game birthing areas from May 1 through June 30.
No similar action	No similar action	Vegetative character of big game birthing areas would be restored on a case-by-case basis using BLM reclamation and monitoring practices (Appendix 9).	No similar action	No similar action

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Black-Footed Ferret: Black-footed ferret searches would be completed according to current USFWS protocol within 1 year prior to conducting any surface disturbing or disruptive activities in all or portions of potential ferret habitat areas (i.e., prairie dog colonies 200 acres or greater in size).	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Black-footed ferret searches would be completed according to current USFWS protocol within 1 year prior to conducting any surface disturbing or disruptive activities in all or portions of potential ferret habitat areas (i.e., prairie dog colonies 200 acres or greater in size).
Should a ferret be found, all disruptive activities would be stopped until protective measures developed with the USFWS could be implemented.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Should a ferret be found, all disruptive activities would be stopped until protective measures developed with the USFWS could be implemented.
BLM would cooperate with USFWS and WGFD on any black-footed ferret reintroduction within the JMH CAP planning area.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: BLM would cooperate with USFWS and WGFD on any black-footed ferret reintroduction within the JMH CAP planning area.
No similar action	Measures would be taken, as appropriate, to reduce potential raptor perches in and around prairie dog towns and colonies.	Same as Alternative 1	Same as Alternative 1	Same as Alternative 1: *Measures would be taken, as appropriate, to reduce potential raptor perches in and around prairie dog towns and colonies.*
Mountain Plover: Mountain plover surveys would be required prior to authorizing any surface disturbing or disruptive activities in potential plover habitat. Surveys would be conducted within suitable mountain plover habitat by a qualified biologist using a protocol determined by the Rock Springs BLM biologist.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Mountain plover surveys would be required prior to authorizing any surface disturbing or disruptive activities in potential plover habitat. Surveys would be conducted within suitable mountain plover habitat by a qualified biologist using a protocol determined by the Rock Springs BLM biologist.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
No similar action	Active mountain plover nesting aggregation areas (Map 17) would be avoidance areas for surface disturbing and disruptive activities from April 10 to July 10.	Active mountain plover nesting aggregation areas (Map 17) would be avoidance areas for surface disturbing and disruptive activities within ¼ mile of the area from April 10 to July 10.	Same as Alternative 2	Same as Alternative 2: *Active mountain plover nesting aggregation areas (Map 17) would be avoidance areas for surface disturbing and disruptive activities within a ¼ mile of the area from April 10 to July 10.*
No similar action	No similar action	Traffic speeds on BLM roads during the brood-rearing period (June and July) would be limited within ¼ mile of nesting concentration areas. Exceptions or other mitigation measures could be applied on a case-by-case basis, as determined by BLM in coordination with commodity users.	Same as Alternative 2	Same as Alternative 2: *Traffic speeds on BLM roads during the brood-rearing period (June and July) would be limited within ¼ mile of nesting concentration areas. Exceptions or other mitigation measures could be applied on a case-by-case basis, as determined by BLM in coordination with commodity users.*
No similar action	No similar action	Measures (i.e., avoidance, burying power lines, installation of anti-perch devices, and exclusion for artificial nest structures) would be taken to limit hunting perches or nest sites for avian predators within ¼ mile of nesting aggregation areas.	Same as Alternative 2	Same as Alternative 2: *Measures (e.g., avoidance, burying power lines, installation of anti-perch devices, and exclusion for artificial nest structures) would be taken to limit hunting perches or artificial nest sites for avian predators within ¼ mile of nesting aggregation areas.*
Game Fish and Special Status Fish Species: Seasonal limitations for surface disturbing activities to protect game and special status fish species during spawning would be applied as necessary.	No similar action	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Seasonal limitations for surface disturbing activities to protect game and special status fish species during spawning would be applied as necessary.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Raptor Nesting Sites: Active and historic raptor nesting sites (Map 17) would be protected and managed for continued nesting activities.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Active and historic raptor nesting sites (Map 17) would be protected and managed for continued nesting activities.
Permanent or high profile structures would be prohibited within a specified distance of active raptor nests. Distance would be determined on a case-by-case basis and would depend on the raptor species involved, natural topographic barriers, line-of-sight distances, etc.	No similar action	Permanent or high profile structures would be prohibited within ½ to 1 mile of active raptor nests.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Permanent or high profile structures would be prohibited within a specified distance of active raptor nests. Distance would be determined on a case-by-case basis and would depend on the raptor species involved, natural topographic barriers, line-of-sight distances, etc.
Temporary disturbances associated with placement of facilities, such as pipelines, and other actions such as seismic activities could be allowed within ½ to 1 mile of active raptor nests.	No similar action	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Temporary disturbances associated with placement of facilities, such as pipelines, and other actions such as seismic activities, could be allowed within ½ to 1 mile of active raptor nests.
Disruptive activities would be seasonally restricted within a ½- to 1-mile radius of occupied raptor nesting sites.	Disruptive activities during the nesting season (February 1 to July 31) would be prohibited within a ¼-mile radius of occupied raptor nest sites.	Disruptive activity restrictions within the specified distance (usually within a ½- to 1-mile radius) of occupied raptor nests would be applied year-round.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Disruptive activities would be seasonally restricted within a ½- to 1-mile radius of occupied raptor nesting sites.
Raptor nest surveys would be conducted within a 1-mile radius or linear distance of proposed surface uses or activities proposed during raptor nesting season (see Table 2-3 for dates, which vary by species).	No similar action	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Raptor nest surveys would be conducted within a 1-mile radius or linear distance of proposed surface uses or activities proposed during raptor nesting season (see Table 2-3 for dates, which vary by species).

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Different species of raptors may require different types of protective measures.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Different species of raptors may require different types of protective measures.
Introduction and Re-introduction of Species: BLM would cooperate with the WGFD in studies for the introduction and re-introduction of native and non-native (game) wildlife and fish species.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: BLM would cooperate with the WGFD in studies for the introduction and re-introduction of native and non-native (game) wildlife and fish species.
BLM will cooperate with the USFWS in studies for, and reintroduction of, special status species.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: BLM would cooperate with the USFWS in studies for, and reintroduction of, special status species.

HERITAGE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT
Management Objective: To expand the opportunities for scientific study, and educational and interpretive uses of cultural and paleontological resources; protect and preserve important cultural and paleontological resources and/or their historic record for future generations; resolve conflicts between cultural/paleontological resources and other resource uses; and to foster opportunities for Native Americans to use heritage resources

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Heritage Resources Protection: Heritage resources in special management areas would remain protected through specific and general management actions (mitigation requirements and site-specific management prescriptions) associated with designated ACECs, WSAs, and National Historic Trails (Appendix 7). Heritage resources are found in the Greater Sand Dunes ACEC (including Boars Tusk and Crookston Ranch), White Mountain Petroglyphs ACEC, South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC (including the Oregon Trail, California Trail, Mormon Pioneer Trail, and Pony Express Route), and the Tri-Territory Marker (Map 2). Other areas may be identified and included in the future pursuant to procedures, including public participation, outlined in Appendix 7.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Heritage resources in special management areas would remain protected through specific and general management actions (mitigation requirements and site-specific management prescriptions) associated with designated ACECs, WSAs, and National Historic Trails (Appendix 7). Heritage resources are found in the Greater Sand Dunes ACEC (including Boars Tusk and Crookston Ranch), White Mountain Petroglyphs ACEC, South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC (including the Oregon Trail, California Trail, Mormon Pioneer Trail, and Pony Express Route), and the Tri-Territory Marker (Map 2). Other areas may be identified and included in the future pursuant to procedures, including public participation, outlined in Appendix 7.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Protection of Scientific Values: Sites that are eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) because of their scientific value would be protected. Preservation of the scientific information would be the preferred mitigation method should any such sites have to be impacted by other activities. These sites include Finley, Krmpotich, and Eden-Farson archaeological sites in the paleosol deposition area. Other sites would be included as they are located, recorded, and evaluated for NRHP eligibility.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Sites that are eligible for inclusion in the NRHP because of their scientific value would be protected. Preservation of the scientific information would be the preferred mitigation method should any such sites have to be impacted by other activities. These sites include Finley, Krmpotich, and Eden-Farson archaeological sites in the West Sand Dunes Archaeological District (paleosol deposition area). Other sites would be included as they are located, recorded, and evaluated for NRHP eligibility.
No similar action	No similar action	Greater Sand Dunes ACEC would be expanded to include the paleosol deposition area.	Greater Sand Dunes ACEC would be expanded to include the paleosol deposition area.	No similar action
No similar action	No similar action	The Greater Sand Dunes ACEC would be managed as a Research Natural Area (RNA). Surface disturbing activities would be prohibited.	Surface disturbing activities would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis following appropriate archeological inventory.	*The paleosol deposition area would be designated a separate special management area called the West Sand Dunes Archaeological District to be managed for scientific study, education, and interpretation.*

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	Subsurface inventory would be required by remote sensing techniques, hand-dug test excavations, or mechanical testing prior to issuing any surface disturbing authorizations in the paleosol deposition area. Subsurface testing would require an approved testing plan and BLM-SHPO consultation. Mitigation may include research-oriented data recovery excavation.	Same as Alternative 3: *Subsurface inventory would be required by remote sensing techniques, hand-dug test excavations, or mechanical testing prior to issuing any surface disturbing authorizations in the West Sand Dunes Archaeological District. Subsurface testing would require an approved testing plan and BLM-SHPO consultation. Mitigation may include research oriented data recovery excavation.*
No similar action	No similar action	The Finley Site would be nominated to the NRHP under the Register's History of American Archaeology context and under the Earliest Americans context.	Same as Alternative 2	Same as Alternative 2: The Finley Site would be nominated to the NRHP under the Register's History of American Archaeology context and under the Earliest Americans context.
No similar action	No similar action	The Krmpotich Site would be nominated to the NRHP under the Register's Earliest Americans context.	Same as Alternative 2	Same as Alternative 2: The Krmpotich Site would be nominated to the NRHP under the Register's Earliest Americans context.
The confidential location of the Finley, Krmpotich, Eden-Farson, and other archeological sites as appropriate would be maintained. Interpretive information would be developed and made available at the Rock Springs Field Office (RSFO).	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: The confidential location of Finley, Krmpotich, Eden-Farson, and other archaeological sites as appropriate would be maintained. Interpretive information would be developed and made available at the RSFO.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
National Register Eligible Sites: All NRHP eligible historic sites would be protected through provisions of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA).	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: All NRHP eligible historic sites are protected through provisions of the NHPA and ARPA.
No similar action	No similar action	Eligible historic properties would be nominated for inclusion in the NRHP.	Several high-profile historic properties would be nominated for inclusion in the NRHP.	Nominations to the NRHP of other eligible sites would be determined on a case-by-case basis.
Pursuant to the Protocol agreement between the BLM and the Wyoming SHPO (Appendix 7), sites eligible for inclusion in the NRHP under Criterion D because of their scientific information content would be surrounded by a 100-foot avoidance area.	Same as No Action Alternative	Sites eligible for inclusion in the NRHP under Criterion D because of their scientific information content would be surrounded by a 300-foot avoidance area.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Pursuant to the Protocol agreement between the BLM and the Wyoming SHPO (Appendix 7), sites eligible for inclusion in the NRHP under Criterion D, because of their scientific information content, would be surrounded by a 100-foot avoidance area.
No similar action	No similar action	BLM would require development proponents to fund preparation of NRHP nominations on a case-by-case basis.	Same as Alternative 2	BLM may request development proponents to fund preparation of NRHP nominations on a case-by-case basis. Sites with uncommon values may require different case-specific management.
Native American Sites: Native American respected places (located generally in the Steamboat Mountain, Steamboat Rim, White Mountain Rim, Essex Mountain, Monument Ridge, and Joe Hay Rim areas) and the Indian Gap Trail would be protected by provisions of the NHPA and the American Indian Religious Freedom Act (AIRFA).	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Native American respected places (located generally in the Steamboat Mountain, Steamboat Rim, White Mountain Rim, Essex Mountain, Monument Ridge, and Joe Hay Rim areas) and the Indian Gap Trail would be protected by provisions of the NHPA and the AIRFA.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Tribal leaders would be consulted and Traditional Cultural Properties (TCP), including respected places, would be protected.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Consultation with tribal leaders concerning management of all identified TCPs, sacred sites, and respected places would be conducted on a regular basis.
No similar action	No similar action	This would include negotiating for related viewsheds with tribal leaders, the State Historic Preservation Officer, and development proponents.	This would include negotiating for related foreground viewsheds with tribal leaders, the State Historic Preservation Officer, and development proponents.	*When activity was proposed in the vicinity of TCPs, sacred sites, and/or eligible respected places, management would be developed through consultation with Tribal leaders, SHPO, and the activity proponent based on the characteristics of the site and the proposed activity. Mitigation may include siting activity in such a way as to protect the foreground viewshed of the area of concern, if appropriate.*
Surface disturbance and disruptive activities would be prohibited within a minimum of 100 feet of respected places. Actual distance would be determined on a case-by-case basis.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Surface disturbance and disruptive activities would be prohibited within a minimum of 100 feet of respected places. Actual distance would be determined on a case-by-case basis.
No similar action	No similar action	The Indian Gap Trail would be researched and mapped, and a trail interpretive plan would be developed.	Same as Alternative 2	Same as Alternative 2: The Indian Gap Trail would be researched and mapped, and a trail interpretive plan would be developed.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Expansion Era Roads and Associated Sites: Expansion Era Roads would be managed similar to the historic trails covered in the Oregon, Mormon Pioneer National Historic Trails Management Plan (BLM 1986), with prescriptions from that plan applied, although the ¼-mile protective setback might not always be applicable. Management actions would include development of activity plans with the objective of preserving the historical integrity of significant NRHP contributing segments of the historic roads.	Same as No Action Alternative	Expansion era roads and associated sites eligible for the NRHP would be protected from activities that would affect their NRHP eligibility status. Activities would be limited within ¼ mile of these roads and sites.	Same as Alternative 2	Same as No Action Alternative: Expansion Era Roads would be managed similar to the historic trails covered in the Oregon, Mormon Pioneer National Historic Trails Management Plan (BLM 1986), with prescriptions from that plan applied, although the ¼-mile protective setback might not always be applicable. Management actions would include development of activity plans with the objective of preserving the historical integrity of significant NRHP contributing segments of the historic roads.
Activity plans may include NRHP nomination of those Expansion Era Roads that qualify.	No similar action	Expansion Era Roads and associated sites eligible for the NRHP would be nominated for listing.	Contributing portions of Expansion Era Roads and associated sites eligible for the NRHP would be nominated for listing.	Same as No Action Alternative: Activity plans may include NRHP nomination of those Expansion Era Roads that qualify.
Historic Livestock Management Sites: Some historic livestock management sites may be eligible for inclusion in the NRHP within the context of the development of pastoral agriculture in Wyoming and the Rocky Mountain region. There is no special management or recognition provisions for these sites under existing management.	NRHP eligible historic livestock management sites would be protected from surface disturbing activities within an area determined on a case-by-case basis.	NRHP eligible historic livestock management sites would be protected from surface disturbing activities within a minimum area of 300 feet.	NRHP eligible historic livestock management sites would be protected from surface disturbing activities within a minimum area of 100 feet.	Same as Alternative 3: *NRHP eligible historic livestock management sites would be protected from surface disturbing activities within a minimum area of 100 feet.*

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Native and Euro-American Sites: Important historic and archaeological sites within the context of early contact between Native and Euro-American peoples would be protected by provisions of the NHPA.	Interpretive signs would be installed where development occurs adjacent to unprotected sites of interest.	An interpretive program, based on BLM and Native American investigation of detailed historical context, would be developed and implemented. Sites would be protected through formal listing in the NRHP and/or through inclusion in the Backcountry Byways program.	An interpretive program on Native and Euro-American peoples would be developed and implemented. Sites would be included in the NRHP and/or Backcountry Byways program on a case-by-case basis.	Same as Alternative 3: An interpretive program on Native and Euro-American peoples would be developed and implemented. Sites would be included in the NRHP and/or Backcountry Byways program on a case-by-case basis.
Paleontological Sites: Documented significant fossil sites would be avoided to protect scientific and educational values. Management guidelines included in BLM Handbook 8270-1 would apply.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Documented significant fossil sites would be avoided to protect scientific and educational values. Management guidelines included in BLM Handbook 8270-1 would apply.
If impacts were unavoidable, the site would be evaluated by a BLM-approved paleontologist (and may require a paleontological survey) who would coordinate with the BLM in developing a mitigation plan that may include activity monitoring, fossil documentation, recovery, and storage in a federally approved repository.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	If impacts were unavoidable, the site would be evaluated by a BLM-approved paleontologist (and may require a paleontological survey) who would coordinate with the BLM in developing a mitigation plan that may include activity monitoring, fossil documentation, recovery, and storage in a federally approved repository.
Unique Geologic Features: The Boars Tusk area (90 acres) would be closed to surface disturbing activities, mineral material sales, and use of explosives and blasting.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: The Boars Tusk area (90 acres) would be closed to surface disturbing activities, mineral material sales, and use of explosives and blasting.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
The area within a ½-mile radius of Boars Tusk (including Boars Tusk) would be closed to blasting and explosive charges.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: The area within a ½-mile radius of Boars Tusk (including Boars Tusk) would be closed to blasting and explosive charges.
The Boars Tusk area would be open to consideration of activities such as fencing, interpretive signs, or transportation barriers to ensure protection of the site. Facilities would be prohibited from being developed on the geologic feature.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: The Boars Tusk area would be open to consideration of activities such as fencing, interpretive signs, or transportation barriers to ensure protection of the site. Facilities would be prohibited from being developed on the geologic feature.
The Boars Tusk area would be a ROW avoidance area, and OHV use would be limited to designated roads and trails.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: The Boars Tusk area would be a ROW avoidance area, and OHV use would be limited to designated roads and trails.
The Boars Tusk and approximately 1,400 acres of BLM-administered public lands in the surrounding area would be closed to any surface mining activity but open to consideration of subsurface mining methods. Activities or ancillary facilities related to subsurface mining would be prohibited.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: The Boars Tusk and approximately 1,400 acres of BLM-administered public lands in the surrounding area would be closed to any surface mining activity but open to consideration of subsurface mining methods. Activities or ancillary facilities related to subsurface mining would be prohibited.
No similar action	No similar action	The Pinnacles Geographic Area (about 8,900 acres) would be an exclusion area for ROWs.	Same as Alternative 2	*The Pinnacles Geologic Feature (about 1,300 acres) would be an exclusion area for ROWs. Surface use would also be controlled.*
No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	*The Pinnacles Proper would be closed to surface disturbance.*

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Mineral leasing and mineral locations actions would be as described in the minerals section for this alternative.	Mineral leasing and mineral locations actions would be as described in the minerals section for this alternative.	Mineral leasing and mineral locations actions would be as described in the minerals section for this alternative.	Mineral leasing and mineral locations actions would be as described in the minerals section for this alternative.	Mineral leasing and mineral locations actions would be as described in the minerals section for this alternative.
No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	*The use of explosives on and within ½ mile of the Pinnacles Geologic Feature would be prohibited.*
No similar action	No similar action	The VRM classification for the Pinnacles Geographic Area (8,900 acres) would be Class I.	Same as Alternative 2	*The VRM classification for the Pinnacles Geologic Feature would be Class II.*
Vehicular travel within ½ mile of the Pinnacles Geologic Feature, and including the features, would be limited to designated roads and trails.	Same as No Action Alternative	The area within ½ mile of the Pinnacles Geologic Feature, and including the features, would be closed to vehicular travel.	Same as Alternative 2	Same as No Action Alternative: Vehicular travel within ½ mile of the Pinnacles Geologic Feature, and including the features, would be limited to designated roads and trails.
Tri-Territory Marker: The Tri-Territory Marker would be an exclusion area for ROWs and would be closed to surface disturbing activities.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: The Tri-Territory Marker would be an exclusion area for ROWs and would be closed to surface disturbing activities.
The Tri-Territory Marker would be withdrawn from mineral location and closed to coal and sodium exploration.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: The Tri-Territory Marker would be withdrawn from mineral location and closed to coal and sodium exploration.
The Tri-Territory Marker would be open for consideration of activities such as fencing, interpretive signs, or barriers to ensure protection of the area.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: The Tri-Territory Marker would be open for consideration of activities such as fencing, interpretive signs, or barriers to ensure protection of the area.

TRAVEL, ACCESS, and REALTY MANAGEMENT
Management Objective: To manage the public lands to support the goals and objectives of other resource programs; respond to public demand for land use authorizations; and to acquire administrative and public access where necessary

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Transportation Planning: No similar action	No similar action	A transportation plan would be developed for the JMH CAP planning area in coordination with local governments and users.	Same as Alternative 2	Same as Alternative 2: A transportation plan would be developed for the JMH CAP planning area in coordination with local governments and users.
No similar action	No similar action	The transportation plan could include mitigation measures (such as offsite placement of facilities, remote control monitoring, restricted or prohibited surface use including road construction, multiple wells from a single pad, central tank batteries/facilities, pipelines and power lines concentrated in specific areas, based on site-specific analysis) in areas subject to seasonal limitations, and CSU and NSO stipulations.	Same as Alternative 2	Same as Alternative 2: The transportation plan could include mitigation measures (such as offsite placement of facilities, remote control monitoring, restricted or prohibited surface use including road construction, multiple wells from a single pad, central tank batteries/facilities, pipelines and power lines concentrated in specific areas, based on site-specific analysis) in areas subject to seasonal limitations and CSU and NSO stipulations.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Transportation planning would provide for appropriate ingress, egress, and access routes that would follow BLM guidelines and road classifications defined in the Green River RMP (Appendix 12). Arterial roads would be high-traffic volume roads that provide primary access to the planning area; collector roads would provide access to large blocks of land; local roads would serve smaller areas; and resource roads would provide access to resource locations.	Same as No Action Alternative	Transportation planning would provide for appropriate access routes to provide maximum protection for crucial habitats and sensitive resources. Transportation planning would consider— • Limiting points of access for all activities to minimize disruption • Closing and rehabilitating unused roads and trails (subject to county review of existing ROWs needs), and those causing resource damage. (Transportation plan and affected maps would be corrected to reflect closed roads and trails.)	Transportation planning would provide for appropriate access routes to provide maximum protection for crucial habitats and sensitive resources. Transportation planning would consider— • Access restrictions such as seasonal road closures and/or gating to limit frequency of access in crucial wildlife habitat • Re-routing or rehabilitating existing roads and trails (subject to county review of existing ROWs needs) causing resource damage.	Transportation planning would provide for access to achieve multiple use goals while providing maximum protection for crucial habitats and sensitive resources. Transportation planning would consider— • Access restrictions such as seasonal road closures and/or gating to limit frequency of access in crucial wildlife habitat • Re-routing or rehabilitating existing roads and trails (subject to county review of existing ROWs needs) causing resource damage.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
		• Avoiding construction of stream or riparian area crossings in sensitive areas and closing unnecessary crossings. Exceptions may be granted if crossings would reduce adverse effects, benefit area objectives, and reduce miles of road and/or frequency of use. Bridges (instead of culverts) would be required for perennial stream crossings • Limiting development zones that would be accessed by designated routes.	• Concentrating stream and riparian area crossings in key locations to avoid disruptions. Exceptions may be granted if crossings would reduce adverse effects, benefit area objectives, and reduce miles of road (and/or frequency of use). Bridges may be required on Pacific, Jack Morrow, Parnell, and Rock Cabin creeks • Posting speed limits, as necessary, to protect wildlife and public health and safety, and to meet area objectives.	• Concentrating stream and riparian area crossings in key locations to avoid disruptions. Exceptions may be granted if crossings would reduce adverse effects, benefit area objectives, and reduce miles of road (and/or frequency of use). Bridges may be required on Pacific, Jack Morrow, Parnell, and Rock Cabin creeks.
Travel Management Plan: No similar action	A travel management plan would not be developed. Travel management would follow the OHV designations in the Steamboat Mountain and White Mountain areas.	In conjunction with the overall transportation planning for JMH, travel management plans would be developed for the two northern calving areas and the Steamboat Mountain, White Mountain, and Essex Mountain areas to control access in these areas.	Same as Alternative 2	Same as Alternative 2: In conjunction with the overall transportation planning for JMH, travel management plans would be developed for the two northern calving areas and the Steamboat Mountain, White Mountain, and Essex Mountain areas to control access in these areas.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Road Installations: Proposed roads and improvements would follow the Green River RMP management objectives and applicable BLM guidelines.	Proposed roads and improvements would follow the Green River RMP transportation guidelines and the Green River Basin Advisory Council (GRBAC) transportation recommendations.	Proposed roads and improvements would follow the Green River RMP management objectives and applicable BLM guidelines until a JMH Transportation Plan was prepared and approved.	Same as Alternative 2	Same as Alternative 2: Proposed roads and improvements would follow the Green River RMP management objectives and applicable BLM guidelines until a JMH Transportation Plan was prepared and approved.
No similar action	No similar action	Proposed roads and improvements for Steamboat Mountain and White Mountain would follow the guidelines specified in Appendix 12.	Same as Alternative 2	Same as Alternative 2: Proposed roads and improvements for Steamboat Mountain and White Mountain would follow the guidelines specified in Appendix 12.
No similar action	No similar action	Exceptions to the JMH Transportation Plan would be considered only if beneficial to natural and cultural resource values.	Exceptions to the JMH Transportation Plan would be considered if they included site-specific conditions that would minimize impacts on natural and cultural resource values.	Same as Alternative 3: Exceptions to the JMH Transportation Plan would be considered if they include site-specific conditions that would minimize impacts on natural and cultural resource values.
Geophysical Activities: Geophysical activities would be required to conform to the OHV Use designations of the Green River RMP.	No similar action	Geophysical activities would be required to conform to the OHV Use designations of the Green River RMP for those portions of the planning area outside of areas with no surface occupancy requirements, WSAs, ACECs, and other sensitive resource areas.	Same as Alternative 2	No similar action

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
No similar action	Geophysical and related detonation activities would be allowed throughout the planning area, subject to seasonal limitations and limitations for sensitive plant species locations.	Geophysical and related detonation activities would be excluded from areas with no surface occupancy requirements, WSAs, ACECs, and other sensitive resource areas. Seasonal limitations would apply.	Same as Alternative 2	The planning area would be open to geophysical exploration and related detonation activities, subject to appropriate mitigation and the same limitations applied to ROWs (Map 49). Exploration activities would be allowed in sensitive resource areas only if they could be performed with acceptable mitigation of impacts.
Geophysical exploration and related detonation activities would be prohibited in WSAs.	No similar action	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Geophysical exploration and related detonation activities would be prohibited in WSAs.
No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	*Geophysical exploration (vehicles and detonation) activities would be prohibited within ½ mile of the Pinnacles Geologic Feature.*
Exceptions may be granted on a case-by-case basis subject to appropriate site-specific analysis and mitigation requirements.	No similar action	No similar action	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Exceptions may be granted on a case-by-case basis subject to appropriate site-specific analysis and mitigation requirements.
Rights-of-Way: The planning area, with the exception of defined exclusion and avoidance areas, would be open to considering grants of ROWs.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: The planning area, with the exception of defined exclusion and avoidance areas, would be open to considering grants of ROWs.
The ROW limitations listed in the Green River RMP would apply as applicable to utilities and other realty actions (Map 8).	The extent of ROW exclusion and avoidance areas would be as shown on Map 18.	The extent of ROW exclusion and avoidance areas would be as shown on Map 27.	The extent of ROW exclusion and avoidance areas would be as shown on Map 40.	*The extent of ROW exclusion and avoidance areas would be as shown on Map 49.*

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Linear Rights-of-Way: No similar action	No similar action	To the extent possible, utility and transportation ROWs would be located to coincide with existing roads, trails, and other ROW or easement concentration areas where they would not create safety hazards or conflict with other resource objectives.	Same as Alternative 2	Same as Alternative 2: To the extent possible, utility and transportation ROWs would be located to coincide with existing roads, trails, and other ROW or easement concentration areas where they would not create safety hazards or conflict with other resource objectives.
Winter Access: Winter access would be subject to seasonal road closures.	Winter access would be limited only by weather and road conditions.	Winter access would be limited to specific roads identified for winter use.	Same as Alternative 2	Same as No Action Alternative: Winter access would be subject to seasonal road closures.
No similar action	No similar action	Where winter access on roads, other than those identified for winter access in the transportation plan, was necessary, routes would be determined on a case-by-case basis.	Where winter access on roads, other than those identified for winter access in the transportation plan, was necessary, routes would be determined on a case-by-case basis in accordance with transportation planning requirements.	Same as Alternative 3: Where winter access on roads, other than those identified for winter access in the transportation plan, was necessary, routes would be determined on a case-by-case basis in accordance with transportation planning requirements.
Plowing of roads would be considered on a case-by-case basis.	Plowing of roads would be allowed as needed.	Plowing of roads would be allowed for emergencies only.	Same as Alternative 1	Same as No Action Alternative: Plowing of roads would be considered on a case-by-case basis.
Off-Highway Vehicle Management: Open to OHV use: Greater Sand Dunes Recreation Area.	Open to OHV use: Same as No Action Alternative	Open to OHV use: Same as No Action Alternative	Open to OHV use: Same as No Action Alternative	Open to OHV use: Same as No Action Alternative: Greater Sand Dunes Recreation Area.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Closed to OHV use: WSAs, Crookston Ranch, Boars Tusk, Special Status Plants, Oregon Buttes ACEC, and White Mountain Petroglyphs ACEC.	Closed to OHV use: Same as No Action Alternative	Closed to OHV use: Same as No Action Alternative	Closed to OHV use: Same as No Action Alternative	Closed to OHV use: Same as No Action Alternative: WSAs, Crookston Ranch, Boars Tusk, Special Status Plants, Oregon Buttes ACEC, and White Mountain Petroglyphs ACEC.
No similar action	No similar action	Closed to OHV use: Raptor nest sites (plus 1/2- to 1-mile buffer), paleosol deposition area, Pinnacles Geographic Area, slopes>20 percent, geologic hazards, greater sage-grouse concentration areas, elk and mule deer birthing areas, and wetlands, floodplains, and riparian areas.	Closed to OHV use: Raptor nest sites (plus 1/2 to 1 mile buffer), Pinnacles Geographic Area, slopes>25 percent and greater sage-grouse leks (plus ½-mile buffer).	*Closed to OHV use:* *Pinnacles Geologic Feature*
OHV use limited to designated roads and trails: Red Desert Watershed, Steamboat Mountain ACEC, and South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC (visible portion).	OHV use limited to designated roads and trails: South Pass Historic Landscape (visible portion) and the Pinnacles Geologic Feature.	OHV use limited to designated roads and trails: All of the planning area that is not designated as open or closed.	OHV use limited to designated roads and trails: Same as No Action Alternative	OHV use limited to designated roads and trails: Same as No Action Alternative: Red Desert Watershed, Steamboat Mountain ACEC, and South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC (visible portion).
OHV use limited to designated roads and trails: No similar action	OHV use limited to designated roads and trails: No similar action	OHV use limited to designated roads and trails: No similar action	OHV use limited to designated roads and trails: Cushion Plant Community ACEC.	OHV use limited to designated roads and trails: *South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC (portion not visible), cushion plant community, and Steamboat Mountain Management Area.*
OHV use limited to existing roads and trails: Remainder of planning area not designated as open, closed, or limited to designated roads and trails.	OHV use limited to existing roads and trails: Remainder of planning area not designated as open, closed, or limited to designated roads and trails.	OHV use limited to existing roads and trails: No similar action	OHV use limited to existing roads and trails: Remainder of planning area not designated as open, closed, or limited to designated roads and trails.	OHV use limited to existing roads and trails: Remainder of planning area not designated as open, closed, or limited to designated roads and trails**.**

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
OHV use limited to seasonal access: Steamboat Mountain, elk and mule deer birthing and crucial winter range areas, antelope crucial winter range, greater sage-grouse leks (plus 2-mile buffer), and raptor nesting sites (plus ½- to 1-mile buffer) on an as needed basis.	OHV use limited to seasonal access: Raptor nesting sites (plus ¼-mile buffer), greater sage-grouse leks (plus 1-mile buffer) and mountain plover aggregation areas.	OHV use limited to seasonal access: Elk, mule deer, and antelope crucial winter range and mountain plover aggregation areas (plus ¼-mile buffer).	OHV use limited to seasonal access: Elk and mule deer birthing and crucial winter range areas, antelope crucial winter range and, greater sage-grouse leks (plus 2-mile buffer), mountain plover aggregation areas (plus ¼-mile buffer).	OHV use limited to seasonal access: Steamboat Mountain, Elk and mule deer birthing and crucial winter range areas, antelope crucial winter range, greater sage-grouse nesting habitat, and raptor nesting sites (plus ½- to 1-mile buffer) on an as needed basis.
Specific roads and trails may be closed to OHV use for public health and safety reasons, for restoration or remediation actions, or for other valid reasons.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Specific roads and trails may be closed to OHV use for public health and safety reasons, for restoration or remediation actions, or for other valid reasons.
Exceptions to closed or limited OHV designations may be granted by the authorized officer for such reasons as scientific purposes, emergency access needs, etc.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Exceptions to closed or limited OHV designations may be granted by the authorized officer for such reasons as scientific purposes, emergency access needs, etc.
Over-the-Snow Vehicles: Over-the-snow vehicles would be required to follow OHV use designations and BLM trails designated for snow vehicle access. Exceptions would be considered on a case-by-case basis.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Over-the-snow vehicles would be required to follow OHV use designations and BLM trails designated for snow vehicle access. Exceptions would be considered on a case-by-case basis.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Land Withdrawals and Exchanges: Withdrawals and exchanges identified in the Green River RMP would be pursued. Exchanges for state lands in WSAs and other special management areas would be considered to avoid conflicting management objectives in these areas. Exchanges would conform to the JMH planning objectives and actions. BLM acquisition of lands would be considered to facilitate various resource management objectives. The preferred method for acquisition would be through exchange. Land exchanges are considered discretionary and voluntary real estate transactions between the willing parties involved.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Withdrawals and exchanges identified in the Green River RMP would be pursued. Exchanges for state lands in WSAs and other special management areas would be considered to avoid conflicting management objectives in these areas. Exchanges would conform to the JMH planning objectives and actions. BLM acquisition of lands would be considered to facilitate various resource management objectives. The preferred method for acquisition would be through exchange. Land exchanges are considered discretionary and voluntary real estate transactions between the willing parties involved.
Ownership Adjustments: Aquatic, wetland, and riparian habitat would not be suitable for disposal unless opportunities exist for land exchanges of equal or greater value, including monetary and functional resource values.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Aquatic, wetland, and riparian habitat would not be suitable for disposal unless opportunities exist for land exchanges of equal or greater value, including monetary and functional resource values.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Access: Access to public, state, and private lands would be provided throughout the planning area and would be limited when necessary to protect public health and safety and to protect sensitive resources.	Access to public, state, and private lands would be provided throughout the planning area and would be limited on a case-by-case basis to protect sensitive resources only in areas of high development potential.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Access to public, state, and private lands would be provided throughout the planning area and would be limited when necessary to protect public health and safety and to protect sensitive resources.
Access would be guaranteed across public lands to landlocked private and state lands consistent with FLPMA.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Access would be guaranteed across public lands to landlocked private and state lands consistent with FLPMA.

RECREATION RESOURCES MANAGEMENT
Management Objective: To ensure the continued availability of outdoor recreational opportunities sought by the public, while providing for other resource values; to meet legal requirements for the health and safety of visitors; and to reduce conflicts between recreation and other types of resource uses

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Backcountry Byways: Recreation project plans would be developed for backcountry byways.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Recreation project plans would be developed for the backcountry byways.
Location of interpretive and directional signs along backcountry byways would be coordinated with state and local governments and other interested parties for— 1) Red Desert viewpoint from dugway of Steamboat Mountain 2) Chicken Springs overlook	Same as No Action Alternative	Location of interpretive and directional signs along backcountry byways would be coordinated with state and local governments and other interested parties for— 1) Red Desert viewpoint from dugway of Steamboat Mountain 2) Chicken Springs overlook 3) Steamboat Mountain 4) Oregon Buttes 5) Honeycomb Buttes 6) Indian Gap	Same as Alternative 2	Same as Alternative 2: Location of interpretive and directional signs along backcountry byways would be coordinated with state and local governments and other interested parties for— 1) Red Desert viewpoint from dugway of Steamboat Mountain 2) Chicken Springs overlook 3) Steamboat Mountain 4) Oregon Buttes 5) Honeycomb Buttes 6) Indian Gap
Greater Sand Dunes Recreation Area: A recreation site plan would be prepared for expansion of the parking area and camping facilities in the Greater Sand Dunes Recreation Area. The plan would address public health and safety, resolving user conflicts, and protecting adjoining resources.	No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	Same as No Action Alternative: A recreation site plan would be prepared for expansion of the parking area and camping facilities in the Greater Sand Dunes Recreation Area. The plan would address public health and safety, resolving user conflicts, and protecting adjoining resources.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Recreation Project Plans: A recreation project plan and interpretive prospectus would be developed, as necessary, for— 1) Crookston Ranch historic site 2) Boars Tusk 3) Wild horse viewing areas 4) Oregon Buttes 5) Honeycomb Buttes 6) Steamboat Mountain 7) National Historic Trails 8) White Mountain Petroglyphs	Same as No Action Alternative	A recreation project plan and interpretive prospectus would be prepared and implemented for— 1) Crookston Ranch historic site 2) Boars Tusk 3) Oregon Buttes 4) Honeycomb Buttes 5) Steamboat Mountain 6) National Historic Trails 7) White Mountain Petroglyphs 8) Native American sites, including Indian Gap.	Same as Alternative 2	A recreation project plan and interpretive prospectus would be prepared and implemented for— 1) Crookston Ranch historic site 2) Boars Tusk 3) Wild horse viewing areas 4) Oregon Buttes 5) Honeycomb Buttes 6) Steamboat Mountain 7) National Historic Trails 8) White Mountain Petroglyphs 9) Native American sites, including Indian Gap.
Camping: Dispersed camping would be allowed within 200 feet of a water source where there were no conflicts with water quality and wildlife and livestock watering areas.	Same as No Action Alternative	Camping would be allowed in designated areas only. Parties of five or more would be required to have a group camping permit and to stay within designated group camping areas.	Camping would be allowed in designated areas only. Parties of 10 or more would be required to have a group camping permit and to stay within designated group camping areas.	Same as No Action Alternative: Dispersed camping would be allowed within 200 feet of a water source where there were no conflicts with water quality and wildlife and livestock watering areas.
Dispersed camping would be prohibited within 200 feet of a water source where there were conflicts with water quality and wildlife and livestock watering areas.	Same as No Action Alternative	No similar action	No similar action	Same as No Action Alternative: Dispersed camping would be prohibited within 200 feet of a water source where there were conflicts with water quality and wildlife and livestock watering areas.
Areas would be closed to camping throughout JMH if resource damage occurred.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Areas would be closed to camping throughout JMH if resource damage occurred.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Special Recreation Use Permits: Application for special recreation use permits would follow existing policy (permits could be issued through any Wyoming field office without review by the RSFO).	Same as No Action Alternative	Special recreation use permits for managed activities in the JMH CAP planning area would be issued and renewed, and fees would be collected through the RSFO.	Same as Alternative 2	Special recreation use permits would be reviewed and subject to recommendations made by the RSFO consistent with JMH Plan objectives prior to any use authorizations.
A Plan of Operation would be required for all commercial recreational operators and outfitters.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: A Plan of Operation would be required for all commercial recreational operators and outfitters.
Recreational Mining and Other Similar Activity: Recreational mining and other similar activity would be allowed throughout the planning area, except where closed or restricted by Wyoming DEQ Guideline No. 19 Noncoal: Non-commercial Recreation Panning and Dredging.	Same as No Action Alternative	Recreational mining and other similar activity would be prohibited in the planning area.	Recreational mining and other similar activity would be limited to a 5-acre site that would be designated in the Dickie Springs-Oregon Gulch Gold Placer Mining District area. A recreation site plan would be prepared and implemented to manage the site for recreational purposes.	*Recreational mining and other similar activity would be allowed in those parts of the planning area that are not withdrawn from mineral location or where such withdrawals would not be pursued.*
Continental Peak/South Pass Connecting Side Trail: No similar action	No similar action	The Continental Peak/South Pass Connecting Side Trail would be managed as a side trail to the existing Continental Divide National Scenic Trail (CDNST).	Same as Alternative 2	Same as Alternative 2: *The Continental Peak/South Pass Connecting Side Trail would be managed as a side trail to the existing Continental Divide National Scenic Trail (CDNST).*

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
No similar action	No similar action	Management would be as described for the CDNST (BLM 1999). Existing primitive two-track roads, BLM roads that provide legal public access through certain private lands, segments of cross-country travel on BLM-administered public land, and an existing trail would be used as components of the CDNST. The existing primitive two-track roads and BLM road segments would continue to be open to motorized use. Cross-country travel routes would not be open to motorized use.	Same as Alternative 2	Same as Alternative 2: *Management would be as described for the CDNST (BLM 1999). Existing primitive two-track roads, BLM roads that provide legal public access through certain private lands, segments of cross-country travel on BLM-administered public land, and an existing trail would be used as components of the CDNST. The existing primitive two-track roads and BLM road segments would continue to be open to motorized use. Cross-country travel routes would not be open to motorized use.*

MINERALS AND ALTERNATIVE ENERGY RESOURCES MANAGEMENT
Management Objective: To maintain or enhance opportunities for mineral exploration and development while providing for other resource values

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Leasable Fluid Minerals Management				
Oil and Gas Leases: Suspended leases in the planning area would be reinstated.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	*Under the implementation, monitoring, and evaluation strategy, suspended leases in the planning area that were put in place during preparation of the JMH CAP would be reinstated within 3 years of signing the Record of Decision or earlier with an approved development plan (Appendix 17). In addition, portions of the planning area would be open to new leases, while others would be closed to new leasing (Map 54).*
No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	*Nominations for new leases within the open portion of the planning area would be considered on a case-by-case basis using the implementation, monitoring, and evaluation process.*

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
As leases expire outside the core area, they would be considered for subsequent lease offerings; within the core area, they would be excluded from subsequent lease offerings.	As leases expire within the entire planning area, they would be considered for subsequent lease offerings.	As leases expire in non-sensitive resource areas, they would be considered for subsequent lease offerings; in sensitive resource areas (including the core area), they would be excluded from subsequent lease offerings.	As leases expire within the entire planning area, they would be considered for subsequent lease offerings on a case-by-case basis, unless monitoring of resource indicators under the adaptive management strategy showed they should not be offered for lease.	*As leases expire within portions of the planning area identified as open to future leasing, they would be considered for subsequent lease offerings on a case-by-case basis and include stipulations identified in Table 2-2, and through the monitoring of resource indicators under the implementation, monitoring, and evaluation management strategy. Twelve basic sensitive resources and uses would be used to evaluate these lands and provide the appropriate stipulations. These sensitive resources and uses may change or be added to in the future based on the implementation, monitoring, and evaluation process.*
The core area would be closed to new leasing.	The core area would be open to new leasing.	Same as No Action Alternative	The core area would be open to new leasing unless monitoring of resource indicators under the adaptive management strategy showed new leases should not be issued.	*A portion of the core area would be open to consideration of new leasing based upon such factors as operational need, resource recovery, geology, and ability to mitigate impacts. The remainder of the core area would be closed to consideration of new leasing (Map 54).*
New leases would be issued outside the core area.	Same as No Action Alternative	New leases would be issued only in non-sensitive resource areas outside the core area.	New leases would be issued outside the core area unless monitoring of resource indicators under the adaptive management strategy showed new leases should not be issued.	*Portions of the planning area outside the core area would be open to new leases, based upon such factors as operational need, resource recovery, geology, and ability to mitigate impacts (Map 54).*
WSAs would be non-discretionary closure areas for oil and gas leasing.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: WSAs would be non-discretionary closure areas for oil and gas leasing.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
No similar action	No similar action	Funding would be pursued for lease buy-out and exchanges. Purchase or exchange of existing leases would be negotiated with willing leaseholders in areas that should be closed to leasing for protection of sensitive resources. Where existing leases in sensitive resource areas could not be exchanged or purchased, development would be allowed under valid existing rights. Existing surface structures, pipelines, and service roads would be reclaimed to pre-development conditions on lease buy-outs and exchanges. Congressional legislation would be required to authorize lease buy-outs.	No similar action	*Buy-out or exchange of existing leases from willing sellers may be considered on a case-by-case basis.* Congressional legislation would be required to authorize lease buyouts.
Lease Stipulations: Stipulations on new leases would be specified to protect other resources and land uses consistent with the Green River RMP. Lease stipulation categories include— 1) Surface disturbance limitations 2) Timing and access restrictions for development activity to protect wildlife 3) Protection of sensitive resources 4) No surface occupancy in designated areas (see Table 2-2 for applicable stipulations and associated acreages for this alternative).	Stipulations on new leases would address only legally mandated resource protection requirements, including the Endangered Species Act (see Table 2-2 for applicable stipulations and associated acreages for this alternative).	Stipulations on new leases would be specified to protect other resources and land uses (see Table 2-2 for applicable stipulations and associated acreages for this alternative).	Stipulations on new leases would be specified to protect other resources and land uses (see Table 2-2 for applicable stipulations and associated acreages for this alternative).	Stipulations on new leases would be specified to protect other resources and land uses (see Table 2-2 for applicable stipulations and associated acreages for this alternative).

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	Additional stipulations on new leases may include provisions for imposing timing and sequencing of development activities based on monitoring of sensitive resource indicators. Emphasis would be on wildlife and wildlife habitat.	No similar action
No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	Monitoring data would be assessed, and appropriate management actions would be determined by an interdisciplinary BLM team (with input from stakeholders and other public entities). Consideration would be given to such factors as weather, disease, drought, hunting pressure, introduction of non-native species, and recreation activities.	Same as Alternative 3: *Monitoring data would be assessed and appropriate management actions would be determined by an interdisciplinary BLM team (with input from stakeholders and other public entities). Lease stipulations may be adjusted or clarified based upon this data. Consideration would be given to such factors as weather, disease, drought, hunting pressure, introduction of non-native species, and recreation activities.*
Drilling Permits: Conditions of Approval (COA) for Applications for Permit to Drill (APD) would allow necessary impacts in order for development to be technically feasible or economically viable.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Conditions of Approval (COAs) for Applications for Permit to Drill (APDs) would allow necessary impacts in order for development to be technically feasible or economically viable.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
COAs for APDs would be based on site-specific analysis and would include general surface control, avoidance, and other requirements for mitigation of development impacts consistent with the Green River RMP.	COAs for APDs would be based on site-specific analysis and would include mitigation measures to protect other resources as required by the regulations for oil and gas development in 43 CFR §3100.	COAs for APDs would be based on site-specific analysis and would establish specific, necessary mitigation measures, not covered by stipulations, for resource and environmental protection, such as avoidance of sensitive resources, seasonal limitations, noise reduction, and remote control operations.	COAs for APDs would be based on site-specific analysis and would establish specific, necessary mitigation measures, not covered by stipulations, for resource and environmental protection (with emphasis on wildlife and wildlife habitat), such as mitigation of effects to sensitive resources, seasonal limitations, noise reduction, and remote control operations.	*COAs for APDs would be based on site-specific analysis and would establish specific, necessary mitigation measures, not covered by stipulations, for resource and environmental protection (with emphasis on all interdisciplinary values), such as mitigation of effects to sensitive resources, seasonal limitations, noise reduction, and remote control operations.*
Exceptions to lease stipulations and COAs would be allowed when site-specific analyses showed impacts to sensitive resources were within acceptable limits.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Exceptions to lease stipulations and COAs would be allowed when site-specific analyses showed impacts to sensitive resources were within acceptable limits.
Well spacing requirements for oil and gas resource protection would defer to the Wyoming Oil and Gas Conservation Commission guidance with consideration for surface resource values.	Well spacing requirements for oil and gas resource protection would defer to the Wyoming Oil and Gas Conservation Commission guidance without consideration for surface resource values.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Well spacing requirements for oil and gas resource protection would defer to the Wyoming Oil and Gas Conservation Commission guidance with consideration for surface resource values.
No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	COAs for timing limitations would be based on monitoring of sensitive resource indicators to ensure unacceptable impacts did not occur.	*COAs for timing limitations would be considered where consistent with lease rights and based on monitoring of sensitive resource indicators, under the implementation, monitoring, and evaluation strategy, to ensure unacceptable impacts did not occur.*

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Leasable Solid Minerals Management				
Exploration: Areas shown on Map 11 (including WSAs) would be closed to coal and sodium exploration, as identified in the Green River RMP.	The entire planning area (except for WSAs) would be open to coal and sodium exploration activities subject to avoidance and right-of-way limitations as needed.	The entire planning area would be closed to coal and sodium exploration activity.	Same as No Action Alternative	Areas shown on Map 55 (including WSAs) would be closed to coal and sodium exploration, as identified in the Green River RMP.
No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	The Cushion Plant Community ACEC and greater sage-grouse leks (with ½-mile buffer) would be closed to coal exploration.	No similar action
Exploration activities in open areas would be allowed on a case-by-case basis with mitigation measures to protect sensitive resources.	No similar action	No similar action	Exploration activities in open areas would be subject to appropriate mitigation and right-of-way limitations (Map 40).	Same as No Action Alternative: Exploration activities in open areas would be allowed on a case-by-case basis with mitigation measures to protect sensitive resources.
Steamboat Mountain ACEC (outside area with coal recommendation) would be closed to exploration.	No similar action	No similar action	Steamboat Mountain ACEC would be closed to exploration.	Same as No Action Alternative: Steamboat Mountain ACEC (outside area with coal recommendation) would be closed to exploration.
No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	*The Steamboat Mountain Management Area (outside area with coal recommendation) would be closed to exploration.*
Leasing: Federal coal lands within the Coal Occurrence and Development Potential Area would be open to further consideration for coal leasing and development.	Same as No Action Alternative	No similar action	Same as No Action Alternative.	Same as No Action Alternative: Federal coal lands within the Coal Occurrence and Development Potential Area would be open to further consideration for coal leasing and development.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Areas closed to leasing would include the Sand Dunes WSA and the western part of the Greater Sand Dunes ACEC.	Same as No Action Alternative	Federal coal lands within the Coal Occurrence and Development Potential Area would be closed to leasing and development to protect other resource values in the planning area.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Areas closed to leasing would include the Sand Dunes WSA and the western part of the Greater Sand Dunes ACEC.
Areas acceptable for leasing for subsurface mining with no surface occupancy requirements would include Boars Tusk and Crookston Ranch.	Same as No Action Alternative	No similar action	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Areas acceptable for leasing for subsurface mining with no surface occupancy requirements would include Boars Tusk and Crookston Ranch.
Areas acceptable for leasing for subsurface mining with controlled surface use would include Steamboat Mountain ACEC, Tri-Territory Marker, raptor nesting sites and the eastern part of Greater Sand Dunes ACEC.	Areas available for leasing for subsurface mining with controlled surface use would include raptor nesting sites, Tri-Territory Marker and the eastern part of Greater Sand Dunes ACEC.	No similar action	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Areas acceptable for leasing for subsurface mining and with controlled surface use would include Steamboat Mountain ACEC, Tri-Territory Marker, raptor nesting sites, and the eastern part of Greater Sand Dunes ACEC.
No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	*Areas acceptable for leasing for subsurface mining with controlled surface use would include Steamboat Mountain Management Area.*
Leasing in big game habitat would be allowed, provided that adequate habitat and overall activity levels could be maintained.	No similar action	No similar action	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Leasing in big game habitat would be allowed, provided that adequate habitat and overall activity levels could be maintained.
Additional areas could become acceptable for leasing consideration through future site-specific application of the coal screening process.	Same as No Action	No similar action	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Additional areas could become acceptable for leasing consideration through future site-specific application of the coal screening process.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Locatable Minerals Management				
Locatable Mineral Withdrawals: Proposed withdrawals from locatable minerals identified in the Green River RMP would be pursued (Map 5). Other withdrawals could be pursued, as necessary.	Same as No Action Alternative	Withdrawals from mineral location would be pursued over the entire planning area (Map 34).	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Proposed withdrawals from locatable minerals identified in the Green River RMP would be pursued (Map 53). Other withdrawals could be pursued as necessary.
No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	Withdrawals from mineral location would be pursued in the northern elk calving areas and the potential diamond development area of Steamboat Mountain ACEC.	*Withdrawals from mineral location would be pursued in the northern elk calving areas (aspen stands plus adjacent, potential aspen habitat), the potential diamond development area of Steamboat Mountain ACEC, and the Pinnacles Geologic Feature.*
No similar action	Withdrawal from mineral location would be pursued for Indian Gap.	No similar action	Withdrawals from mineral location would be pursued in areas with no surface occupancy requirements, including active raptor nest sites and Indian Gap.	No similar action
Withdrawals from mineral location under the coal and oil shale classifications would be revoked.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Withdrawals from mineral location under the coal and oil shale classifications would be revoked.
With the exception of withdrawn areas, the planning area would be open to mineral location.	Same as No Action Alternative	No similar action	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: With the exception of withdrawn areas, the planning area would be open to mineral location.
A notice would be required for exploration activities when surface disturbance would be 5 acres or less and when less than 1,000 tons of presumed ore would be removed for testing.	Same as No Action Alternative	No similar action	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: A notice would be required for exploration activities when surface-disturbance would be 5 acres or less and when less than 1,000 tons of presumed ore would be removed for testing.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
A plan of operations would be required when exploration exceeded notice level activity, for mining activities, or when material was extracted for commercial use.	Same as No Action Alternative	No similar action	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: A plan of operations would be required when exploration exceeded notice level activity, for mining activities, or when material was extracted for commercial use.
A plan of operations would be required for all activities greater than casual use occurring within ACECs, WSAs, areas designated as "closed" to off-road vehicle use, and any lands or waters known to contain federally proposed or listed threatened or endangered species or their proposed or designated critical habitat.	Same as No Action Alternative	No similar action	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: A plan of operations would be required for all activities greater than casual use occurring within ACECs, WSAs, areas designated as "closed" to off-road vehicle use, and any lands or waters known to contain federally proposed or listed threatened or endangered species or their proposed or designated critical habitat.
Salable Minerals Management				
Mineral Material Sales: Areas shown on Map 12 would be closed to mineral material sales. No similar action	Areas shown on Map 24 would be closed to mineral material sales No similar action	The entire planning area would be closed to mineral material sales (Map 35). No similar action	Areas shown on Map 46 would be closed to mineral material sales. The lava portion of the Steamboat Mountain ACEC would be closed to mineral material sales.	Areas shown on Map 58 would be closed to mineral material sales. Same as Alternative 3: *The lava portion of the Steamboat Mountain ACEC would be closed to mineral material sales.*
No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	*The remainder of the Steamboat Mountain ACEC and the Steamboat Mountain Management Area would be open to mineral material sales only when required to meet other planning objectives within the planning area.*

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	The area within ½ mile of greater sage-grouse leks would be closed to mineral material sales.	*The area within ¼ mile of greater sage-grouse leks would be closed to mineral material sales.* *Greater sage-grouse nesting habitat would be open to mineral material sales only if related disturbance and reclamation could occur during one field season (August 1–November 15) and the site could be returned (through reclamation efforts) to a condition usable by greater sage-grouse.*
No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	*The Pinnacles Geologic Feature would be closed to mineral material sales.*
The remainder of the planning area would be open to mineral material sales where such activity would not cause unacceptable impacts (Map 12).	The remainder of the planning area would be open to mineral material sales where such activity would not cause unacceptable impacts (Map 24).	No similar action	The remainder of the planning area would be open to mineral material sales where such activity would not cause unacceptable impacts (Map 46).	The remainder of the planning area would be open to mineral material sales where such activity would not cause unacceptable impacts (Map 58).
Mining and reclamation plans would be required for use areas, and use and management would be in conformance with other resource objectives.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Mining and reclamation plans would be required for use areas, and use and management would be in conformance with other resource objectives.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Alternative Energy Management				
Alternative Energy Proposals: No similar action	The planning area would be open to alternative energy development, such as wind or solar farms, where development would comply with statutory resource protection standards.	The planning area would be closed to alternative energy development proposals.	The planning area would be open for consideration of alternative energy development proposals where such activity would not cause unacceptable impacts to sensitive resources. Transmission and utility lines and access roads would comply with ROW limitations and requirements of the JMH transportation plan.	Same as Alternative 3: *The planning area would be open for consideration of alternative energy development proposals where such activity would not cause unacceptable impacts to sensitive resources. Transmission and utility lines and access roads would comply with ROW limitations and requirements of the JMH transportation plan.*

VISUAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT
Management Objective: To maintain or improve scenic values and visual quality; and to establish priorities for managing the visual resources in conjunction with other resource values

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
VRM Class I Areas: WSAs would be managed as VRM Class I areas to preserve the natural setting and existing character of the landscape.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: WSAs would be managed as VRM Class I areas to preserve the natural setting and existing character of the landscape.
Oregon Buttes ACEC and the western portion of Greater Sand Dunes ACEC, which fall within a WSA, would also be managed as a VRM Class I area.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Oregon Buttes ACEC and the western portion of Greater Sand Dunes ACEC, which fall within a WSA, would also be managed as VRM Class I areas.
No similar action	No similar action	All ACECs (which includes Indian Gap), unique geologic features and landforms including Boars Tusk (plus a 1-mile buffer), Freighter Gap, portions of White Mountain, and the portion of the Red Desert Watershed within the planning area, would be managed as VRM Class I areas.	No similar action	No similar action

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
VRM Class II Areas: The eastern portion of Greater Sand Dunes ACEC, South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC, White Mountain Petroglyphs ACEC, and areas adjacent to WSAs would be managed as VRM Class II areas (Map 13).	The South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC, Greater Sand Dunes ACEC, White Mountain Petroglyphs ACEC, and areas adjacent to WSAs would be managed as VRM Class II areas (Map 25).	No similar action	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: The eastern portion of Greater Sand Dunes ACEC, South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC, White Mountain Petroglyphs ACEC, and areas adjacent to WSAs would be managed as VRM Class II areas (Map 59).
The southern portion of Steamboat Mountain ACEC would be managed as a VRM Class II area (Map 13).	No similar action	No similar action	Steamboat Mountain ACEC would be managed as a VRM Class II area (Map 47).	*Steamboat Mountain ACEC would be managed as a VRM Class II area (Map 59).*
No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	*The Steamboat Mountain Management Area would be managed as a VRM Class II area.*
No similar action	No similar action	All sensitive habitat areas, wetlands, riparian areas, and floodplains would be managed as VRM Class II areas (Map 36).	No similar action	No similar action
No similar action	No similar action	Split Rock would be managed as a VRM Class II area.	Unique geological features and landforms, including Indian Gap and Boars Tusk, Split Rock, portions of White Mountain, and the portion of the Red Desert Watershed within the planning area, would be managed as VRM Class II areas (Map 47).	*Unique geological features and landforms, including portions of White Mountain, Pinnacles Geological Feature, and the West Sand Dunes Archeological District, would be managed as VRM Class II areas (Map 59).*
No similar action	No similar action	The portions of the National Historic Trail and National Scenic Trails located within the planning area would be managed as VRM Class II areas (Map 36).	The portions of the National Historic Trail and National Scenic Trails within the planning area would be managed as VRM Class II areas (Map 47).	No similar action

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
VRM Class III: Eden Valley, portions of White Mountain, Split Rock, and the portion of the Red Desert Watershed within the planning area would be managed as VRM Class III (Map 13).	No areas would be managed as VRM Class III.	All areas not managed as VRM Class I or II for this alternative would be managed as VRM Class III (Map 36).	Eden Valley would be managed as VRM Class III (Map 47).	Same as No Action Alternative: Eden Valley, portions of White Mountain, Split Rock and the portion of the Red Desert Watershed within the planning area would be managed as VRM Class III (Map 59).
The northern portion of Steamboat Mountain ACEC would be managed as a Class III area (Map 13).	No similar action	Same as No Action Alternative	No similar action	No similar action
VRM Class IV: All areas not managed as VRM Class I, II, or III for this alternative would be managed as VRM Class IV (Map 13).	All areas not managed as VRM Class I or II for this alternative would be managed as VRM Class IV (Map 25).	No areas would be managed as VRM Class IV.	All areas not managed as VRM Class I, II, or III for this alternative would be managed as VRM Class IV (Map 47).	All areas not managed as VRM Class I, II, or III for this alternative would be managed as VRM Class IV (Map 59).

MANAGEMENT OF SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREAS AND OTHER MANAGEMENT AREAS
Management Objective: To maintain or enhance the resource values and characteristics for which the area was designated as a special management area

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Wilderness Study Areas				
Geophysical Activities: Geophysical exploration and related detonation activities would be prohibited.	No similar action	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Geophysical exploration and related detonation activities would be prohibited.
Rights-of-Way: No similar action	No similar action	These areas would be managed as ROW exclusion areas.	Same as Alternative 2	No similar action
OHV Use: These areas would be closed to OHV use.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: These areas would be closed to OHV use.
Leasable Fluid Minerals: These areas would be non-discretionary closure areas for fluid minerals leasing.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: These areas would be non-discretionary closure areas for fluid minerals leasing.
Leasable Solid Minerals: These areas would be closed to leasable solid minerals exploration and leasing.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: These areas would be closed to leasable solid minerals exploration and leasing.
Salable Minerals: These areas would be closed to mineral material sales.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: These areas would be closed to mineral material sales.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Locatable Minerals: A plan of operations would be required for all activities greater than casual use. No similar action	Same as No Action Alternative No similar action	No similar action Withdrawals from mineral location would be pursued in the entire planning area.	Same as No Action Alternative No similar action	Same as No Action Alternative: A plan of operations would be required for all activities greater than casual use. No similar action
VRM: These areas would be managed as VRM Class I areas to preserve the natural setting and existing character of the landscape.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: These areas would be managed as VRM Class I areas to preserve the natural setting and existing character of the landscape.
Oregon Buttes ACEC				
Geophysical Activities: Geophysical activities and related detonation activities would be prohibited within the ACEC.	No similar action	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Geophysical activities and related detonation activities would be prohibited within the ACEC.
Rights-of-Way: The ACEC would be managed as a ROW avoidance area.	Same as No Action Alternative	The ACEC would be managed as a ROW exclusion area.	Same as Alternative 2	Same as Alternative 2: *The ACEC would be managed as a ROW exclusion area.*
OHV Use: The ACEC would be closed to OHV use.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: The ACEC would be closed to OHV use.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Recreation: No similar action	No similar action	Location of interpretive and directional signs along backcountry byways would be coordinated with state and local governments and other interested parties for Oregon Buttes.	Same as Alternative 2	Same as Alternative 2: Location of interpretive and directional signs along backcountry byways would be coordinated with state and local governments and other interested parties for Oregon Buttes.
A recreation project plan and interpretive prospectus would be developed, as necessary, for Oregon Buttes.	Same as No Action Alternative	A recreation project plan and interpretive prospectus would be prepared and implemented for Oregon Buttes.	Same as Alternative 2	Same as Alternative 2: A recreation project plan and interpretive prospectus would be prepared and implemented for Oregon Buttes.
Leasable Fluid Minerals: The ACEC would be closed to consideration of fluid minerals leasing.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: The ACEC would be closed to consideration of fluid minerals leasing.
Leasable Solid Minerals: The ACEC would be closed to leasable solid minerals exploration and leasing.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: The ACEC would be closed to leasable solid minerals exploration and leasing.
Salable Minerals: The ACEC would be closed to mineral material sales.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: The ACEC would be closed to mineral material sales.
Locatable Minerals: A plan of operations would be required for all activities greater than casual use.	Same as No Action Alternative	No similar action	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: A plan of operations would be required for all activities greater than casual use.
No similar action	No similar action	Withdrawal from mineral location would be pursued in the entire planning area.	No similar action	No similar action

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
VRM: The ACEC would be managed as a VRM Class I area.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: The ACEC would be managed as a VRM Class I area.
South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC				
Rights-of-Way: South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC (visible portion) would be managed as a ROW exclusion area.	The entire ACEC would be managed as a ROW avoidance area.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC (visible portion) would be managed as a ROW exclusion area *for any ROW action that would adversely affect the viewshed (such as major transmission facilities or high-profile facilities)*.
South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC (non-visible portion) would be managed as a ROW avoidance area.	No similar action	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC (non-visible portion) would be managed as a ROW avoidance area.
OHV Use: OHV use within South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC (visible portion) would be limited to designated roads and trails.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	*OHV use within the entire ACEC would be limited to designated roads and trails.*
OHV use within South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC (non-visible portion) would be limited to existing roads and trails.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	No similar action

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Leasable Fluid Minerals: South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC (visible portion) would be open to consideration of fluid minerals leasing with no surface occupancy requirements.	No similar action	The entire ACEC would be closed to fluid minerals leasing	Same as No Action Alternative	Portions of the South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC (visible portion) would be open to consideration of fluid minerals leasing with no surface occupancy requirements.
Portions of South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC (non-visible portion) would be open to consideration of fluid minerals leasing with controlled surface use requirements (Map 10).	No similar action	No similar action	South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC (non-visible portion) would be open to consideration of fluid minerals leasing with stipulations to protect other resources (Map 42). Stipulations could include, but would not be limited to, no surface occupancy requirements, controlled surface use, and timing of development activity.	*Portions of the South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC (non-visible portion) would be open to fluid minerals leasing consideration with stipulations to protect other resources (Map 54). Stipulations could include, but would not be limited to, no surface occupancy requirements, controlled surfaced use, and timing of development activity.*
No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	*A portion of the South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC would be closed to fluid minerals leasing (Map 54).*
No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	*As leases expire in the area open to leasing consideration, they would be considered for subsequent lease offerings on a case-by-case basis with lease stipulations to protect sensitive resources. Leases that expire in the area identified as closed to fluid mineral leasing would not be considered for subsequent lease offerings. A portion along the perimeter of the area identified as closed to future oil and gas leasing (Figure A17-2, Appendix 17) would be considered for leasing with an NSO stipulation.*

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Leasable Solid Minerals: South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC (visible portion) would be closed to leasable solid minerals exploration and leasing.	The entire ACEC would be open to leasable solid minerals exploration and leasing with avoidance and ROW limitations, as needed.	The entire ACEC would be closed to leasable solid minerals exploration and leasing.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC (visible portion) would be closed to leasable solid minerals exploration and leasing.
Salable Minerals: South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC (visible portion) would be closed to mineral material sales.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC (visible portion) would be closed to mineral material sales.
Locatable Minerals: No similar action	No similar action	Withdrawal from mineral location would be pursued for the entire ACEC.	No similar action	No similar action
Withdrawal from mineral location would be pursued on South Pass Summit.	Same as No Action Alternative	No similar action	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Withdrawal from mineral location would be pursued on South Pass Summit.
No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	Withdrawal from mineral location would be pursued for the northern elk calving areas in part of the South Pass historic Landscape ACEC.	Same as Alternative 3: *Withdrawal from mineral location would be pursued for the northern elk calving areas in part of the South Pass historic Landscape ACEC.*

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
VRM: The entire ACEC would be managed as a VRM Class II area.	Same as No Action Alternative	Managed as a VRM Class I area.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: The entire ACEC would be managed as a VRM Class II area.
The South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC viewshed would be maintained from approximately 3 miles of the Oregon, Mormon, California, and Pony Express Trail routes.	The South Pass Historic Landscape viewshed would be reduced to approximately 1 mile in each direction from the center of the Oregon, Mormon Pioneer, California, and Pony Express Trail routes.	The South Pass Historic Landscape viewshed would be expanded to approximately five miles of the Oregon, Mormon, California and Pony Express trail routes.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: The South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC viewshed would be maintained from approximately three miles of the Oregon, Mormon, California and Pony Express trail routes.
Intrusions within the viewshed area could be allowed, provided the results of a visual analysis indicated they were not visible from the trail routes or that they could be mitigated.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Intrusions within the viewshed area could be allowed, provided the results of a visual analysis indicated they were not visible from the trail routes or that they could be mitigated.
White Mountain Petroglyphs ACEC				
Rights-of-Way: The ACEC would be managed as a ROW exclusion area.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: The ACEC would be managed as a ROW exclusion area.
OHV Use: The ACEC would be closed to OHV use outside of identified access and parking areas.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: The ACEC would be closed to OHV use outside of identified access and designated parking areas.
Recreation: A recreation project plan and interpretive prospectus would be developed, as necessary.	Same as No Action Alternative	A recreation plan and interpretive prospectus would be prepared and implemented.	Same as Alternative 2	Same as Alternative 2: A recreation project plan and interpretive prospectus would be prepared and implemented.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Leasable Fluid Minerals: The ACEC would be open to consideration of fluid minerals leasing with no surface occupancy requirements.	Same as No Action Alternative	The ACEC would be closed to fluid minerals leasing.	Same as No Action Alternative	*The ACEC would be closed to fluid mineral leasing consideration.* The area would be managed as an NSO area for other surface disturbing and disruptive activities.
Leasable Solid Minerals: White Mountain Petroglyphs Vista would be closed to coal and sodium exploration.	The ACEC would be open to coal and sodium exploration activities subject to avoidance and ROW limitations as needed.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: White Mountain Petroglyphs Vista would be closed to coal and sodium exploration.
Salable Minerals: The ACEC would be closed to mineral material sales.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: The ACEC would be closed to mineral material sales.
Locatable Minerals: Withdrawal from mineral location would be pursued.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Withdrawal from mineral location would be pursued.
VRM: The ACEC would be managed as VRM Class II area.	Same as No Action Alternative	Would be managed as VRM Class I area.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: The ACEC would be managed as VRM Class II area.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Steamboat Mountain ACEC				
Steamboat Mountain ACEC designation and boundaries would remain unchanged (Map 14).	Steamboat Mountain ACEC designation would be removed.	Steamboat Mountain ACEC would be expanded to include the area of highest concentration and overlap of big game habitat features, natural systems, and cultural values. These include the largest portion of elk crucial winter range and birthing area overlap, a portion of the sand dunes stabilized by the basin big sagebrush/ lemon scurfpea plant community, and the Native American respected places of Indian Gap and portions of the Indian Gap Trail (Map 37).	Steamboat Mountain ACEC would be expanded to include all of Indian Gap and the face of Steamboat Mountain. This would include portions of the basin big sagebrush/lemon scurfpea vegetation community (Map 48).	*Steamboat Mountain ACEC would be expanded to include the highest concentration and overlap of unique habitat features, natural systems, and cultural values. These include a portion of the sand dunes stabilized by the basin big sagebrush/ lemon scurfpea plant community, and the Native American respected places of Indian Gap and portions of the Indian Gap Trail (Map 60).*
No similar action	No similar action	The basin big sagebrush/lemon scurfpea vegetation community would be further evaluated as an RNA and designated as though the criteria were met (Map 37).	No similar action	No similar action
Rights-of-Way: The ACEC would be managed as a ROW avoidance area.	No similar action	The ACEC would be managed as a ROW exclusion area.	The southern portion of the ACEC would be managed as a ROW exclusion area. The remainder of the ACEC would be managed as a ROW avoidance area.	Same as No Action Alternative: The ACEC would be managed as a ROW avoidance area.
Communication Sites: Communication sites would be prohibited in Steamboat Mountain ACEC.	Communication sites would be considered on Steamboat Mountain.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Communication sites would be prohibited in Steamboat Mountain ACEC.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
OHV Use: OHV use would be limited to designated roads and trails.	OHV use would be limited to existing roads and trails.	Same as Alternative 1	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: OHV use would be limited to designated roads and trails.
Recreation: Location of interpretive and directional signs along backcountry byways would be coordinated with state and local governments and other interested parties for the Red Desert viewpoint from Dugway of Steamboat Mountain.	Same as No Action Alternative	Location of interpretive and directional signs along backcountry byways would be coordinated with state and local governments and other interested parties for Steamboat Mountain.	Same as Alternative 2	Same as Alternative 2: Location of interpretive and directional signs along backcountry byways would be coordinated with state and local governments and other interested parties for Steamboat Mountain.
A recreation project plan and interpretive prospectus would be developed, as necessary, for Steamboat Mountain.	Same as No Action Alternative	A recreation plan and interpretive prospectus would be prepared and implemented for Steamboat Mountain.	Same as Alternative 2	Same as Alternative 2: A recreation project plan and interpretive prospectus would be prepared and implemented for Steamboat Mountain.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Leasable Fluid Minerals: No similar action	No similar action	The ACEC would be closed to fluid minerals leasing consideration.	Steamboat Mountain ACEC would be open to consideration of fluid minerals leasing consideration with stipulations to protect other resources (Map 42). Stipulations could include, but would not be limited to, no surface occupancy requirements, controlled surface use, and timing of development activity.	*Most of the ACEC would be closed to fluid minerals leasing consideration (Map 54). The remainder of the ACEC would be open to consideration of fluid minerals leasing consideration with stipulations to protect other resources. Stipulations could include, but would not be limited to, no surface occupancy requirements, controlled surface use, and timing of development activity.*
No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	*As leases expire in the area open to leasing consideration, they would be considered for subsequent lease offerings on a case-by-case basis based upon such factors as operational need, resource recovery, geology, and ability to mitigate impacts. Leases that expire in the area identified as closed to fluid mineral leasing would not be considered for subsequent lease offerings. A portion along the perimeter of the area identified as closed to future oil and gas leasing (Figure A17-2, Appendix 17) would be considered for leasing with an NSO stipulation.*

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Leasable Solid Minerals: The portions of Steamboat Mountain ACEC within the coal development potential area would be open to leasable solid minerals exploration and leasing using only subsurface mining methods and controls on surface facilities (Map 6).	Same as No Action Alternative	The entire ACEC would be closed to solid leasable solid minerals exploration and leasing.	Same as Alternative 2	Same as No Action Alternative: The portions of Steamboat Mountain ACEC within the coal development potential area would be open to leasable solid minerals exploration and leasing using only subsurface mining methods and controls on surface facilities (Map 57).
Those portions outside the coal development potential area would be closed to leasable solid minerals exploration and leasing (Map 6 and Map 11).	Same as No Action Alternative	No similar action	No similar action	Same as No Action Alternative: Those portions outside the coal development potential area would be closed to leasable solid minerals exploration and leasing (Map 55 and Map 57).
Salable Minerals: The entire ACEC would be closed to mineral material sales.	No similar action	Same as no Action Alternative	The lava portion of the ACEC would be closed to mineral material sales.	Same as Alternative 3: *The lava portion of the ACEC would be closed to mineral material sales.*
No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	The remainder of the ACEC would be open only when required to meet other planning objectives within the JMH CAP planning area.	Same as Alternative 3: *The remainder of the ACEC would be open only when required to meet other planning objectives within the JMH CAP planning area.*
Locatable Minerals: No similar action	No similar action	Withdrawal from mineral location would be pursued in the entire ACEC.	Withdrawal from mineral location would be pursued in the potential diamond development area of Steamboat Mountain ACEC.	Same as Alternative 3: *Withdrawal from mineral location would be pursued in the potential diamond development area of Steamboat Mountain ACEC.*
VRM: The southern portion of the ACEC would be managed as a VRM Class II area. The northern portion would be managed as a VRM class III area.	The entire ACEC would be managed as a VRM class IV area.	The entire ACEC would be managed as a VRM Class I area.	The entire ACEC would be managed as a VRM class II area.	Same as Alternative 3: *The entire ACEC would be managed as a VRM Class II area.*

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Greater Sand Dunes ACEC				
The Greater Sand Dunes ACEC designation and boundaries would remain unchanged (Map 14).	Same as No Action Alternative	The Greater Sand Dunes ACEC would be expanded to include the paleosol deposition area (Map 37).	Same as Alternative 2	Same as No Action Alternative: The Greater Sand Dunes ACEC designation and boundaries would remain unchanged (Map 14).
No similar action	No similar action	The expansion area would be managed as an RNA.	No similar action	No similar action
No similar action	No similar action	The portion of the ACEC within the WSA containing the dunal ponds (flockets) would be further evaluated as an RNA and designated as such if the criteria are met (Map 37).	No similar action	No similar action
Rights-of-Way: The ACEC would be managed as a ROW avoidance area (within 1 mile or the visual horizon, whichever is closer).	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	The ACEC would be managed as a ROW avoidance area.	Same as No Action Alternative: The ACEC would be managed as a ROW avoidance area (within 1 mile or the visual horizon, whichever is closer).
No similar action	No similar action	The expansion area of ACEC (paleosol deposition area) would be managed as a ROW exclusion area.	No similar action	No similar action
OHV Use: The portion of the ACEC containing the Greater Sand Dunes Recreation Area would be open to OHV use. The remainder of the ACEC would be limited to existing roads and trails.	Same as No Action Alternative	The portion of the ACEC containing the Greater Sand Dunes Recreation Area would be open to OHV use. The remainder of the ACEC would be limited to designated roads and trails.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: The portion of the ACEC containing the Greater Sand Dunes Recreation Area would be open to OHV use. The remainder of the ACEC would be limited to existing roads and trails.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Recreation: A recreation site plan would be prepared for expansion of the parking area and camping facilities at the Greater Sand Dunes Recreation Area. The plan would address public health and safety, resolving user conflicts, and protecting adjoining resources.	No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	Same as No Action Alternative: A recreation site plan would be prepared for expansion of the parking area and camping facilities at the Greater Sand Dunes Recreation Area. The plan would address public health and safety, resolving user conflicts, and protecting adjoining resources.
Leasable Fluid Minerals: No similar action	No similar action	The ACEC would be closed to fluid mineral leasing.	The portion of the ACEC outside the WSA would be open to fluid minerals leasing consideration with stipulations to protect other resources (Map 42). Stipulations could include, but would not be limited to, no surface occupancy requirements, controlled surface use, and timing of development activity.	Same as Alternative 3: *A portion of the ACEC outside the WSA would be open to fluid minerals leasing consideration with stipulations to protect other resources (Map 54). Stipulations could include, but would not be limited to, no surface occupancy requirements, controlled surface use, and timing of development activity.*
No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	Other portions of the ACEC would be closed to fluid mineral leasing (Map 42).	Same as Alternative 3: *Other portions of the ACEC would be closed to fluid mineral leasing (Map 54).*
No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	*As leases expire in the area open to leasing consideration, they would be considered for subsequent lease offerings on a case-by-case basis based upon such factors as operational need, resource recovery, geology, and ability to mitigate impacts. Leases that expire in the area identified as closed to fluid mineral leasing would not be considered for subsequent lease offerings.*

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Leasable Solid Minerals: The western portion of the ACEC would be closed to leasable solid minerals exploration and leasing. The eastern portion of the ACEC within the coal development potential area would be open to leasable solid minerals exploration and leasing using only subsurface mining methods and controls on surface facilities.	Same as No Action Alternative Same as No Action Alternative	The entire ACEC would be closed to leasable solid minerals exploration and leasing. No similar action	Same as No Action Alternative Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: The western portion of the ACEC would be closed to leasable solid minerals exploration and leasing. Same as No Action Alternative: The eastern portion of the ACEC within the coal development potential area would be open to leasable solid minerals exploration and leasing using only subsurface mining methods and controls on surface facilities.
Salable Minerals: The ACEC would be closed to mineral material sales.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: The ACEC would be closed to mineral material sales.
Locatable Minerals: Withdrawals from mineral location would be pursued in the western portion of the ACEC.	Same as No Action Alternative	Withdrawals from mineral location would be pursued in the entire ACEC.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Withdrawals from mineral location would be pursued in the western portion of the ACEC.
VRM: The ACEC would be managed as a VRM Class II area.	Same as No Action Alternative	The ACEC would be managed as a VRM Class I area.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: The ACEC would be managed as a VRM Class II area.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Special Status Plants ACEC				
The Special Status Plant Species ACEC (identified in the Green River RMP) could be expanded into the JMH CAP planning area on a case-by-case basis. No similar action	The Special Status Plant Species ACEC would not be expanded into the JMH CAP planning area. No similar action	The Special Status Plant Species ACEC would be expanded into the JMH CAP planning area where such species are located (Map 37). The Special Status Plant Species ACEC would be expanded into the JMH CAP area where potential habitat for such species is located (Map 37).	Same as Alternative 2 No similar action	Same as No Action Alternative: The Special Status Plant Species ACEC (identified in the Green River RMP) could be expanded into the JMH CAP planning area on a case-by-case basis. No similar action
Disruptive Activities: Potential habitat of special status plant species' communities on federal lands or on split estate lands would require searches for the plant species prior to approving any project or activity. Should species be found, all disruptive activities would be halted until species-specific, protective measures were developed and implemented. For listed species, protective measures would be developed and implemented in coordination with the USFWS.	Same as no Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Potential habitat of special status plant species' communities on federal land or on split estate lands would require searches for the plant species prior to approving any project or activity. Should species be found, all disruptive activities would be halted until species-specific, protective measures were developed and implemented. For listed species, protective measures would be developed and implemented in coordination with the USFWS.
Rights-of-Way: Areas where special status plants occur would be managed as ROW avoidance areas.	Same as No Action Alternative	The ACEC would be managed as a ROW exclusion area.	The ACEC would be managed as a ROW exclusion area.	Same as No Action Alternative: Areas where special status plants occur would be managed as ROW avoidance areas.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
OHV Use: Areas where special status plants occur would be closed to OHV use.	Same as no Action Alternative	The ACEC would be closed to OHV use.	Same as Alternative 2: The ACEC would be closed to OHV use.	Same as no Action Alternative: Areas where special status plants occur would be closed to OHV use.
Leasable Fluid Minerals: Known locations of special status plant species would be open to consideration for mineral leasing with no surface occupancy requirements.	Known locations of special status plant species would be open to consideration for mineral leasing with controlled surface use requirements.	The ACEC would be closed to all mineral leasing.	The ACEC would be open to consideration for mineral leasing with no surface occupancy requirements.	Known locations of special status plant species would be open to consideration for mineral leasing with no surface occupancy requirements, *unless they occur in the area identified as closed to fluid mineral leasing (Map 54).*
Leasable Solid Minerals: Areas where special status plants occur would be closed to coal and sodium exploration as identified in the Green River RMP.	Areas where special status plants occur would be open to coal and sodium exploration subject to avoidance and ROW limitations as needed.	The ACEC would be closed to coal and sodium exploration.	Same as Alternative 2: The ACEC would be closed to coal and sodium exploration.	Same as No Action Alternative: Areas where special status plants occur would be closed to coal and sodium exploration as identified in the Green River RMP.
Salable Minerals: Areas where special status plants occur would be closed to mineral material sales.	Same as no Action Alternative	The ACEC would be closed to mineral material sales.	Same as Alternative 2: The ACEC would be closed to mineral material sales.	Same as no Action Alternative: Areas where special status plants occur would be closed to mineral material sales.
Locatable Minerals: Withdrawals from mineral location would be pursued where special status plants occur.	Same as no Action Alternative	Same as no Action Alternative	Same as no Action Alternative	Same as no Action Alternative: Withdrawals from mineral location would be pursued where special status plants occur.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Rangeland Management: Salt or mineral supplements would not be allowed in areas where special status plant species occur.	Same as No Action Alternative	Salt or mineral supplements would not be allowed within ½ mile of areas where special status plant species occur.	Salt or mineral supplements would not be allowed within ¼ mile of areas where special status plant species occur.	Same as No Action Alternative: No salt or mineral supplements would be allowed in areas where special status plant species occur.
Vegetation treatments would be designed to protect and conform to special status plant species.	No similar action	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Vegetation treatments would be designed to conform to requirements to protect or enhance special status plant species.
Herbicide loading sites would be prohibited within 500 feet of special status plant locations and would be used in accordance with the guidelines in Appendix 8, Standard Operating Procedures for Range Improvements and Vegetation Manipulations.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Herbicide loading sites would be prohibited within 500 feet of special status plant locations and would be used in accordance with the guidelines in Appendix 8, Standard Operating Procedures for Range Improvements and Vegetation Manipulations.
Fire Management: Fire suppression vehicular activities would be limited to existing roads and trails in special status plant species habitat. A site-specific analysis would be prepared for all fire management activities around special status plant species sites to determine the appropriate fire management response.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Fire suppression vehicular activities would be limited to existing roads and trails in special status plant species habitat. A site-specific analysis would be prepared for all fire management activities around special status plant species sites to determine the appropriate fire management response.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Cushion Plant Community ACEC				
No similar action	No similar action	Cushion plant communities would be designated an ACEC (Map 37).	Same as Alternative 2	No similar action
No similar action	No similar action	The Cushion Plant Community ACEC would be further evaluated for designation as an RNA and designated as such if the criteria were met.	No similar action	No similar action
Rights-of-Way: No similar action	No similar action	The ACEC would be managed as an exclusion area for ROWs or other surface disturbing activities.	The ACEC would be managed as an avoidance area for ROWs or other surface disturbing activities.	No similar action
Leasable Solid Minerals: No similar action	No similar action	The ACEC would be closed to leasable solid minerals exploration and leasing.	The ACEC would be closed to leasable solid minerals exploration.	No similar action
Salable Minerals: No similar action	No similar action	The ACEC would be closed to mineral material sales.	No similar action	No similar action
Locatable Minerals: No similar action	No similar action	Withdrawals from mineral location would be pursued.	No similar action	No similar action
West Sand Dunes Archeological District				
No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	*The paleosol deposition area would be designated a separate special management area called the West Sand Dunes Archaeological District to be managed for scientific study, education, and interpretation.*

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Rights-of-Way: No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	*The area would be managed as a ROW avoidance area.*
Leasable Fluid Minerals: No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	Most of the area would be open to consideration for fluid minerals leasing with requirements to protect sensitive resources. *Approximately 6,660 acres would be closed to fluid mineral leasing (Map 54). A portion along the perimeter of the area identified as closed to future oil and gas leasing (Figure A17-2, Appendix 17) would be considered for leasing with an NSO stipulation.*
VRM: No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	*The area would be managed as a VRM Class II area.*
Pinnacles Geologic Feature				
The Pinnacles Geologic Feature would continue to be managed as part of the Red Desert Watershed Management Area, as provided in the Green River RMP.	Same as No Action Alternative	The Pinnacles Geologic Feature would be designated an ACEC.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: The Pinnacles Geologic Feature would continue to be managed as part of the Red Desert Watershed Management Area, as provided in the Green River RMP.
Rights-of-Way: No similar action	No similar action	The area would be managed as a ROW exclusion area.	Same as Alternative 2	Same as Alternative 2: *The area would be managed as a ROW exclusion area.*
Geophysical Activities: No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	*Geophysical exploration vehicles and detonation activities would be prohibited within ½ mile of the Pinnacles Geologic Feature.*

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
OHV Use: OHV use would be limited to existing roads and trails.	OHV use would be limited to designated roads and trails.	The area would be closed to OHV use.	Same as Alternative 2	Same as Alternative 2: *The area would be closed to OHV use.*
Leasable Fluid Minerals: No similar action	No similar action	The area would be closed to fluid minerals leasing.	Same as Alternative 2	Same as Alternative 2: *The area would be closed to fluid minerals leasing consideration (Map 54).*
Leasable Solid Minerals: No similar action	No similar action	The area would be closed to leasable solid minerals exploration.	Same as Alternative 2	No similar action
Salable Minerals: No similar action	No similar action	The area would be closed to mineral material sales.	Same as Alternative 2	Same as Alternative 2: *The area would be closed to mineral material sales.*
Locatable Minerals: No similar action	No similar action	Withdrawals from mineral location would be pursued.	No similar action	Same as Alternative 2: *Withdrawals from mineral location would be pursued.*
VRM: The area would be managed as a VRM Class III area.	The area would be managed as a VRM Class IV area.	The area would be managed as a VRM Class I area.	Same as Alternative 2	*The area would be managed as a VRM Class II area.*
Pinnacles Geographic Area				
The Pinnacles Geographic Area would continue to be managed as part of the Red Desert Watershed Management Area, as provided in the Green River RMP.	Same as No Action Alternative	No similar action	No similar action	Same as No Action Alternative: The Pinnacles Geographic Area would continue to be managed as part of the Red Desert Watershed Management Area, as provided in the Green River RMP.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Rights-of-Way: No similar action	No similar action	The area would be managed as a ROW exclusion area.	Same as Alternative 2	No similar action
OHV Use: No similar action	No similar action	The area would be closed to OHV use.	Same as Alternative 2	No similar action
Leasable Fluid Minerals: No similar action	No similar action	The area would be closed to fluid minerals leasing.	Same as Alternative 2	Same as Alternative 2: *The area would be closed to fluid minerals leasing (Map 54). A portion along the perimeter of the area identified as closed to future oil and gas leasing (Figure A17-2, Appendix 17) would be considered for leasing with an NSO stipulation.*
Leasable Solid Minerals: No similar action	No similar action	The area would be closed to leasable solid minerals exploration and leasing.	The area would be closed to leasable solid minerals exploration.	No similar action
Salable Minerals: No similar action	No similar action	The area would be closed to mineral material sales.	Same as Alternative 2	No similar action
Locatable Minerals: No similar action	No similar action	Withdrawals from mineral location would be pursued.	No similar action	No similar action
VRM: No similar action	No similar action	The area would be managed as a VRM Class I.	Same as Alternative 2	No similar action

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Steamboat Mountain Management Area				
No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	The Steamboat Mountain Management Area would be a geographic area which would include the Steamboat Mountain ACEC, the Steamboat Mountain ACEC proposed expansion, and additional area containing other important Native American cultural values, important watershed values, unique wildlife habitat features, and crucial and overlapping big game habitat.
Rights-of-Way: No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	*The Steamboat Mountain Management Area would be managed as a ROW avoidance area.*
OHV Use: No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	*OHV use would be limited to designated roads and trails.*
Leasable Fluid Minerals: No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	*Approximately 77,000 acres would be closed to fluid minerals leasing (Map 54). The remainder of the area would be open to consideration of fluid minerals leasing with mitigation to protect sensitive resources.*

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
				As leases expire in portions of the area open to leasing consideration, they would be considered for subsequent lease offerings on a case-by-case basis with lease stipulations to protect sensitive resource. *As leases expire in other portions (Area 2 in Appendix 17) of the area open to leasing consideration, they would be considered for subsequent lease offerings on a case-by-case basis based upon such factors as operational need, resource recovery, geology, and ability to mitigate impacts. Leases that expire in the area identified as closed to fluid mineral leasing would not be considered for subsequent lease offerings. A portion along the perimeter of the area identified as closed to future oil and gas leasing (Figure A17-2, Appendix 17) would be considered for leasing with an NSO stipulation.* *The remainder of the area would be closed to consideration of new leasing.*

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Leasable Solid Minerals: No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	*The Steamboat Mountain Management Area (outside area with coal recommendation) would be closed to leasable solid minerals exploration.* *The Steamboat Mountain Management Area would be open to solid minerals leasing for subsurface mining with controls on surface activities and facilities.*
Salable Minerals: No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	*The Steamboat Mountain Management Area would be closed to mineral material sales.*
VRM: No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	No similar action	*The Steamboat Mountain Management Area would be managed as a VRM Class II area.*
Red Desert Watershed Management Area				
OHV Use: OHV use would be limited to designated roads and trails.	No similar action	No similar action	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: OHV use would be limited to designated roads and trails.
Leasable Fluid Minerals: No similar action	No similar action	The area would be closed to fluid minerals leasing.	No similar action	Approximately 42,250 acres would be closed to fluid minerals leasing (Map 54). The remainder of the area would be open to consideration of fluid mineral leasing with mitigation to protect sensitive resources.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
				As leases expire in portions of the area open to leasing consideration, they would be considered for subsequent lease offerings on a case-by-case basis with lease stipulations to protect sensitive resource. As leases expire in other portions (Area 2 in Appendix 17) of the area open to leasing consideration, they would be considered for subsequent lease offerings on a case-by-case basis based upon such factors as operational need, resource recovery, geology, and ability to mitigate impacts. Leases that expire in the area identified as closed to fluid mineral leasing would not be considered for subsequent lease offerings. A portion along the perimeter of the area identified as closed to future oil and gas leasing (Figure A17-2, Appendix 17) would be considered for leasing with an NSO stipulation.
VRM: The area would be managed as a VRM Class III area.	No similar action	The area would be managed as a VRM Class I area.	The area would be managed as a VRM Class II area.	Same as No Action Alternative: The area would be managed as a VRM Class III area.

Table 2-2. Areas of Fluid Mineral Lease Conditional Requirements by Hydrocarbon Potential (Approximate Acres)[1]

Area	Hydrocarbon Potential			Total
	High	Moderate	Low	
GENERAL PLANNING AREA				
NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE:				
NO LEASE[2]				
Core area	82,700	0	0	82,700
Total Affected Area (in acres)	**82,700**	**0**	**0**	**82,700**
NO SURFACE OCCUPANCY[4]				
Boars Tusk	30	0	0	30
White Mountain Petroglyphs vista	0	510	0	510
Greater Sand Dunes ACEC (developed recreation sites and OHV parking lot	50	0	0	50
Tri-Territory Marker	10	0	0	10
Indian Gap + 100-foot buffer	750	0	0	750
Crookston Ranch + 100-foot buffer	60	0	0	60
South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC (visible portion)	270	5,610	16,060	21,940
Raptor nest sites (active)	140	240	10	390
Special status plants[5]	2,760	0	110	2,870
Total Affected Area (in acres)[6]	**2,830**	**5,610**	**16,140**	**24,580**
CONTROLLED SURFACE USE[4]				
Wetlands, riparian areas, and 100-year floodplains + 500-foot buffer	49,670	27,230	8,550	85,450
National Historic Trails + ¼-mile buffer	130	2,130	7,370	9,630
Expansion Era Roads + ¼-mile buffer	4,000	1,550	1,360	6,910
Slopes > 25 percent	15,390	2,850	1,590	19,830
South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC (portion not visible)	2,860	6,970	16,490	26,320
VRM Class II lands	49,310	44,230	70,360	163,900
Special status plants potential habitat[8]	0	0	1,150	1,150
Greater sage-grouse leks + ¼-mile buffer[7]	820	2,080	720	3,620
Total Affected Area (in acres)[6]	**56,970**	**62,490**	**54,220**	**173,680**
SEASONAL LIMITATIONS[4]				
Elk crucial habitat	117,810	7,660	0	125,470
Deer crucial habitat	39,280	0	0	39,280
Antelope crucial habitat	12,950	41,030	0	53,980
Elk birthing areas	71,370	8,440	4,690	84,500
Deer birthing areas	24,590	320	3,930	28,840
Raptor nest sites + ½- to 1-mile buffer	9,780	15,590	1,290	26,660
Greater sage-grouse leks + ¼-mile buffer[7]	820	2,080	720	3,620
Greater sage-grouse nesting area + 2-mile buffer[7]	38,600	62,870	26,260	127,730
Greater sage-grouse winter concentration areas[7]	410	0	0	410
Total Affected Area (in acres)[6]	**170,640**	**90,410**	**32,490**	**293,540**
ALTERNATIVE 1:				
NO LEASE[2]				
Total Affected Area (in acres)	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
NO SURFACE OCCUPANCY[4]				
Indian Gap + 100-foot buffer	750	0	0	750
Boars Tusk	30	0	0	30
Tri-Territory Marker	10	0	0	10
Crookston Ranch + 100-foot buffer	60	0	0	60
Total Affected Area (in acres)	**820**	**0**	**0**	**820**

Table 2-2. Areas of Fluid Mineral Lease Conditional Requirements by Hydrocarbon Potential (Approximate Acres)[1] (Continued)

Area	Hydrocarbon Potential			Total
	High	Moderate	Low	
CONTROLLED SURFACE USE[4]				
Wetlands, riparian areas, and 100-year floodplains + 250-foot buffer	25,550	14,050	4,310	43,910
Expansion Era Roads + ¼-mile buffer	4,000	1,550	1,360	6,910
Slopes > 25 percent	15,390	2,850	1,590	19,830
South Pass Historic Landscape viewshed (1-mile buffer)	450	7,010	21,000	28,460
Greater sage-grouse leks + ¼-mile buffer[7]	820	2,080	720	3,620
Special status plants[5]	2,760	0	110	2,870
Special status plants potential habitat[8]	0	0	1,150	1,150
Total Affected Area (in acres)[6]	**46,330**	**25,790**	**26,260**	**98,380**
SEASONAL LIMITATIONS[4]				
Greater sage-grouse potential nesting habitat[7,9]	8,170	14,720	6,330	29,220
Raptor nest sites + ¼-mile buffer	1,490	1,990	130	3,610
Mountain plover aggregation areas[7]	120	0	0	120
Total Affected Area (in acres)[6]	**9,610**	**16,640**	**6,460**	**32,710**
ALTERNATIVE 2:				
NO LEASE[2]				
Pinnacles Geographic Area	8,950	0	0	8,950
ACECs + expansions	113,880	31,290	33,750	178,920
Red Desert Watershed Management Area	71,040	24,940	8,530	104,510
Wetlands, riparian areas, and 100-year floodplains + 500-foot buffer	49,670	27,230	8,550	85,450
National Historic Trails + ¼-mile buffer	130	2,130	7,370	9,630
Expansion Era Roads + ¼-mile buffer	4,000	1,550	1,360	6,910
Tri-Territory Marker	10	0	0	10
Slopes > 20 percent	36,920	9,370	8,680	54,970
Greater sage-grouse concentration areas[7]	50,110	65,420	31,220	146,750
Greater sage-grouse winter range[7,10]	57,740	9,460	0	67,200
Raptor nest sites + ½- to 1-mile buffer	9,780	15,590	1,290	26,660
Mountain plover aggregation areas[7]	120	0	0	120
Elk crucial habitat	117,810	7,660	0	125,470
Deer crucial habitat	39,280	0	0	39,280
Antelope crucial habitat	12,950	41,030	0	53,980
Elk birthing areas	71,370	8,440	4,690	84,500
Deer birthing areas	24,590	320	3,930	28,840
Connectivity area	161,040	47,350	21,960	230,350
Total Affected Area (in acres)[6]	**239,380**	**127,710**	**53,390**	**420,480**
NO SURFACE OCCUPANCY[3,4]				
White Mountain Petroglyphs vista	0	510	0	510
South Pass Historic Landscape (visible portion)	230	8,040	27,770	36,040
Boars Tusk	30	0	0	30
Indian Gap + 100-foot buffer	750	0	0	750
Tri-Territory Marker	10	0	0	10
Crookston Ranch + 300-foot buffer	90	0	0	90
Total Affected Area (in acres)[6]	**1,700**	**370**	**2,580**	**4,650**

Table 2-2. Areas of Fluid Mineral Lease Conditional Requirements by Hydrocarbon Potential (Approximate Acres)[1] (Continued)

Area	Hydrocarbon Potential			Total
	High	Moderate	Low	
CONTROLLED SURFACE USE[3,4]				
Wetlands, riparian areas, and 100-year floodplains + ¼-mile buffer	121,890	66,700	23,130	211,720
Total Affected Area (in acres)[6]	**3,400**	**3,240**	**1,700**	**8,340**
SEASONAL LIMITATIONS[3,4]				
Elk crucial habitat	117,810	7,660	0	125,470
Deer crucial habitat	39,280	0	0	39,280
Antelope crucial habitat	12,950	41,030	0	53,980
Mountain plover aggregation areas + ¼-mile buffer[7]	1,340	0	0	1,340
Total Affected Area (in acres)	**141,980**	**48,160**	**0**	**190,140**
ALTERNATIVE 3:				
NO LEASE[2]				
Pinnacles Geographic Area	8,950	0	0	8,950
Total Affected Area (in acres)	**8,950**	**0**	**0**	**8,950**
NO SURFACE OCCUPANCY[3,4]				
Boars Tusk	30	0	0	30
White Mountain Petroglyphs vista	0	510	0	510
Crookston Ranch + 100-foot buffer	60	0	0	60
Indian Gap + 100-foot buffer	750	0	0	750
Tri-Territory Marker	10	0	0	10
Special Status Plants ACEC[5]	2,760	0	110	2,870
Raptor nest sites (active)	140	240	10	390
Greater sage-grouse leks + ½-mile buffer[7]	2,970	7,230	2,480	12,680
Total Affected Area (in acres)[6]	**6,550**	**7,740**	**2,590**	**16,880**
CONTROLLED SURFACE USE[3,4]				
Wetlands, riparian areas, and 100-year floodplains + ¼-mile buffer	121,900	66,670	23,150	211,720
Special status plants potential habitat[8]	0	0	1,150	1,150
Slopes > 20 percent	36,920	9,370	8,680	54,970
Remaining ACECs + expansions	67,710	30,060	32,560	130,330
National Historic Trails + ¼-mile buffer	130	2,130	7,370	9,630
Expansion Era Roads + ¼-mile buffer	4,000	1,550	1,360	6,910
Total Affected Area (in acres)[6]	**156,600**	**71,470**	**44,820**	**272,890**
SEASONAL LIMITATIONS[3,4]				
Elk crucial habitat	117,810	7,660	0	125,470
Deer crucial habitat	39,280	0	0	39,280
Antelope crucial habitat	12,950	41,030	0	53,980
Elk birthing areas	71,370	8,440	4,690	84,500
Deer birthing areas	24,590	320	3,930	28,840
Raptor nest sites + ½- to 1-mile buffer	9,780	15,590	1,290	26,660
Mountain plover aggregation areas + ¼-mile buffer[7]	1,340	0	0	1,340
Greater sage-grouse leks + ¼-mile buffer	820	2,080	720	3,620
Greater sage-grouse potential nesting habitat[7,9]	29,040	40,470	20,240	89,750
Greater sage-grouse winter range[7,10]	57,740	9,460	0	67,200
Total Affected Area (in acres)[6]	**163,850**	**121,810**	**28,300**	**313,960**

Table 2-2. Areas of Fluid Mineral Lease Conditional Requirements by Hydrocarbon Potential (Approximate Acres)[1] (Continued)

Area	Hydrocarbon Potential			Total
	High	Moderate	Low	
PROPOSED JMH CAP:				
NO LEASE[2]				
Area 3 minus the NSO areas (Appendix 17)	125,270	34,500	18,490	178,260
Sensitive resources	14,200	7,350	7,020	28,570
Total Affected Area (in acres)[6]	**125,280**	**36,020**	**18,500**	**179,800**
NO SURFACE OCCUPANCY[3,4]				
Indian Gap + 100-foot buffer	750	0	0	750
Greater Sand Dunes ACEC (developed recreation sites and OHV parking lot)	50	0	0	50
Crookston Ranch + 100-foot buffer	60	0	0	60
South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC (visible portion)	270	5,610	16,060	21,940
Special status plants[5]	2,760	0	110	2,870
Raptor nest sites (active)	140	240	10	390
Sensitive resources	23,510	5,620	2,660	31,790
Area 3 NSO areas (Appendix 17)	17,000	14,530	4,520	36,050
Total Affected Area (in acres)[6]	**20,390**	**19,910**	**18,470**	**58,770**
CONTROLLED SURFACE USE[3,4]				
Wetlands, riparian areas, and 100-year floodplains + 500-foot buffer	49,670	27,230	8,550	85,450
National Historic Trails + ¼-mile buffer	130	2,130	7,370	9,630
Slopes > 20 percent	36,920	9,370	8,680	54,970
ACECs + expansions	66,380	12,640	32,560	111,580
Steamboat Mountain Management Area	88,300	0	0	88,300
Areas adjacent to WSAs	23,750	32,370	16,040	72,160
Portion of White Mountain	0	2,740	0	2,740
West Sand Dunes Archaeological District	0	18,710	0	18,710
Special status plants potential habitat[8]	0	0	1,150	1,150
Greater sage-grouse potential nesting habitat[7,9]	92,900	100,360	40,870	234,130
Greater sage-grouse winter range[7,10]	57,740	9,460	0	67,200
Sensitive resources	12,220	8,900	40	21,160
Total Affected Area (in acres)[6]	**108,080**	**83,580**	**23,970**	**215,630**
SEASONAL LIMITATIONS[3,4]				
Elk crucial habitat	117,810	7,660	0	125,470
Deer crucial habitat	39,280	0	0	39,280
Antelope crucial habitat	12,950	41,030	0	53,980
Elk birthing areas	71,370	8,440	4,690	84,500
Deer birthing areas	24,590	320	3,930	28,840
Raptor nest sites + ½- to 1-mile buffer	9,780	15,590	1,290	26,660
Greater sage-grouse leks + ¼-mile buffer	820	2,080	720	3,620
Greater sage-grouse potential nesting habitat[7,9]	92,840	100,090	40,870	233,800
Greater sage-grouse winter range[7,10]	57,740	9,460	0	67,200
Mountain plover aggregation areas + ¼-mile buffer[7]	1,340	0	0	1,340
Total Affected Area (in acres)[6]	**215,360**	**115,070**	**41,970**	**372,400**

Table 2-2. Areas of Fluid Mineral Lease Conditional Requirements by Hydrocarbon Potential (Approximate Acres)[1] (Continued)

Area	Hydrocarbon Potential			Total
	High	Moderate	Low	
CORE AREA				
NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE:				
NO LEASE[2]				
Core area	82,700	0	0	82,700
Total Affected Area (in acres)	**82,700**	**0**	**0**	**82,700**
NO SURFACE OCCUPANCY[4]				
Total Affected Area (in acres)[6]	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
CONTROLLED SURFACE USE[4]				
Total Affected Area (in acres)[6]	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
SEASONAL LIMITATIONS[4]				
Elk crucial habitat	69,580	0	0	69,580
Deer crucial habitat	21,630	0	0	21,630
Elk birthing areas	48,920	0	0	48,920
Deer birthing areas	24,570	0	0	24,570
Raptor nest sites + ½- to 1-mile buffer	2,330	0	0	2,330
Greater sage-grouse leks + ¼-mile buffer[7]	20	0	0	20
Greater sage-grouse nesting area + 2-mile buffer[7]	3,870	0	0	3,870
Greater sage-grouse winter concentrations areas[7]	30	0	0	30
Total Affected Area (in acres)[6]	**72,250**	**0**	**0**	**72,250**
ALTERNATIVE 1:				
NO LEASE[2]				
Total Affected Area (in acres)	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
NO SURFACE OCCUPANCY[4]				
Indian Gap + 100-foot buffer	750	0	0	750
Tri-Territory Marker	10	0	0	10
Total Affected Area (in acres)	**760**	**0**	**0**	**760**
CONTROLLED SURFACE USE[4]				
Wetlands, riparian areas, and 100-year floodplains + 250-foot buffer	8,170	0	0	8,170
Greater sage-grouse leks + ¼-mile buffer[7]	20	0	0	20
Slopes > 25 percent	9,760	0	0	9,760
Total Affected Area (in acres)[6]	**17,760**	**0**	**0**	**17,760**
SEASONAL LIMITATIONS[4]				
Greater sage-grouse potential nesting habitat[7,9]	240	0	0	240
Raptor nest sites + ¼-mile buffer	640	0	0	640
Mountain plover aggregation areas[7]	20	0	0	20
Total Affected Area (in acres)[6]	**900**	**0**	**0**	**900**

Table 2-2. Areas of Fluid Mineral Lease Conditional Requirements by Hydrocarbon Potential (Approximate Acres)[1] (Continued)

Area	Hydrocarbon Potential			Total
	High	Moderate	Low	
ALTERNATIVE 2:				
NO LEASE[2]				
ACECs + expansions	78,400	0	0	78,400
Red Desert Watershed Management Area	3,240	0	0	3,240
Wetlands, riparian areas, and 100-year floodplains + 500-foot buffer	15,530	0	0	15,530
Tri-Territory Marker	10	0	0	10
Greater sage-grouse concentration areas[7]	5,400	0	0	5,400
Greater sage-grouse winter range[7,10]	2,980	0	0	2,980
Raptor nest sites + ½- to 1-mile buffer	2,330	0	0	2,330
Mountain plover aggregation areas[7]	20	0	0	20
Elk crucial habitat	69,580	0	0	69,580
Deer crucial habitat	21,630	0	0	21,630
Elk birthing areas	48,920	0	0	48,920
Deer birthing areas	24,570	0	0	24,570
Connectivity area	82,670	0	0	82,670
Slopes > 20 percent	22,100	0	0	22,100
Total Affected Area (in acres)[6]	**82,700**	**0**	**0**	**82,700**
NO SURFACE OCCUPANCY[3,4]				
Total Affected Area (in acres)[6]	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
CONTROLLED SURFACE USE[3,4]				
Total Affected Area (in acres)[6]	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
SEASONAL LIMITATIONS[3,4]				
Elk crucial habitat	69,580	0	0	69,580
Deer crucial habitat	21,630	0	0	21,630
Mountain plover aggregation areas + ¼-mile buffer[7]	250	0	0	250
Total Affected Area (in acres)[6]	**72,150**	**0**	**0**	**72,150**
ALTERNATIVE 3:				
NO LEASE[2]				
Total Affected Area (in acres)	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
NO SURFACE OCCUPANCY[3,4]				
Crookston Ranch + 100 ft.	60	0	0	60
Indian Gap + 100 ft.	750	0	0	750
Tri-Territory Marker + 100 ft.	10	0	0	10
Greater sage-grouse leks + ½-mile buffer[7]	160	0	0	160
Raptor nest sites (active)	60	0	0	60
Total Affected Area (in acres)[6]	**1,030**	**0**	**0**	**1,030**
CONTROLLED SURFACE USE[3,4]				
Wetlands, riparian areas, and 100-yr floodplains + ¼-mile buffer	38,430	0	0	38,430
Slopes > 20%	22,100	0	0	22,100
ACECs + expansions	60,580	0	0	60,580
Total Affected Area (in acres)[6]	**70,110**	**0**	**0**	**70,110**

Table 2-2. Areas of Fluid Mineral Lease Conditional Requirements by Hydrocarbon Potential (Approximate Acres)[1] (Continued)

Area	Hydrocarbon Potential			Total
	High	Moderate	Low	
SEASONAL LIMITATIONS[3,4]				
Elk crucial habitat	69,580	0	0	69,580
Deer crucial habitat	21,630	0	0	21,630
Elk birthing areas	48,920	0	0	48,920
Deer birthing areas	24,570	0	0	24,570
Raptor nest sites + ½- to 1-mile buffer	2,330	0	0	2,330
Greater sage-grouse leks + ¼-mile buffer[7]	20	0	0	20
Greater sage-grouse potential nesting habitat[7,9]	940	0	0	940
Greater sage-grouse winter range[7,10]	2,980	0	0	2,980
Mountain plover aggregation areas + ¼-mile buffer[7]	250	0	0	250
Total Affected Area (in acres)[6]	**72,420**	**0**	**0**	**72,420**
PROPOSED JMH CAP:				
NO LEASE[2]				
Area 3 minus NSO areas (Appendix 17)	58,370	0	0	58,370
Sensitive resources	12,900	0	0	12,900
Total Affected Area (in acres)	**58,370**	**0**	**0**	**58,370**
NO SURFACE OCCUPANCY[3,4]				
Crookston Ranch + 100-foot buffer	60	0	0	60
Indian Gap + 100-foot buffer	750	0	0	750
Greater Sand Dunes ACEC (developed recreation sites and OHV parking lot)	50	0	0	50
Raptor nest sites (active)	60	0	0	60
Sensitive resources	13,320	0	0	13,320
Area 3 NSO areas (Appendix 17)	4,150	0	0	4,150
Total Affected Area (in acres)[6]	**5,940**	**0**	**0**	**5,940**
CONTROLLED SURFACE USE[3,4]				
Wetlands, riparian areas, and 100-year floodplains + 500-foot buffer	15,530	0	0	15,530
Slopes > 20 percent	22,100	0	0	22,100
ACECs + expansions	63,060	0	0	63,060
Areas adjacent to WSAs	5,540	0	0	5,540
Steamboat Mountain Management Area	63,780	0	0	63,780
Greater sage-grouse potential nesting habitat[7,9]	1,510	0	0	1,510
Greater sage-grouse winter range[7,10]	2,980	0	0	2,980
Sensitive resources	4,730	0	0	4,730
Total Affected Area (in acres)[6]	**18,500**	**0**	**0**	**18,500**
SEASONAL LIMITATIONS[3,4]				
Elk crucial habitat	69,580	0	0	69,580
Deer crucial habitat	21,630	0	0	21,630
Elk birthing areas	48,920	0	0	48,920
Deer birthing areas	24,570	0	0	24,570
Raptor nest sites + ½- to 1-mile buffer	2,330	0	0	2,330
Greater sage-grouse leks + ¼-mile buffer[7]	20	0	0	20
Greater sage-grouse potential nesting habitat[7,9]	1,510	0	0	1,510
Greater sage-grouse winter range[7,10]	2,980	0	0	2,980
Mountain plover aggregation areas + ¼-mile buffer[7]	250	0	0	250
Total Affected Area (in acres)[6]	**72,420**	**0**	**0**	**72,420**

[1]Lease parcels are designed on aliquot parts. The actual acreage for the lease may vary.

[2]Although closed to leasing and related oil and gas activity, any other surface disturbing or disrupting use would follow the surface disturbance prescriptions (see Table 4-8).

[3]All activities would be subject to intensive mitigation based on site-specific analysis. These could include offsite placement of facilities; remote control monitoring; restricted or prohibited surface use, including road construction; multiple wells from a single pad; central tank batteries/facilities; pipelines and power lines concentrated in specific areas; etc.

[4]Refer to Appendix 5. These requirements apply to all surface disturbing activities.

[5]As new populations are identified, their locations will be added to this total.

[6]Acres may not add because of overlapping land resources and land use restrictions. Acres only reflect proposed fluid mineral lease stipulations.

[7]A lease stipulation is applied to all leases for protection of special status species and their habitats.

[8]Acres will change as floristic inventories identify actual areas with potential.

[9] Only 50 percent of area is expected to be suitable nesting habitat.

[10]Only sagebrush vegetation is expected to be suitable habitat.

Table 2-3. Wildlife Limitations by Alternative

Species/Habitat with Applicable Buffer	Limitation Time (month/day)	No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
SEASONAL LIMITATIONS						
Greater sage-grouse leks (with ¼-mile buffer)	2/1–6/30	X				
Greater sage-grouse leks (with ¼-mile buffer)	3/1–5/15				X	X
Greater sage-grouse leks (with ¼-mile buffer)	Case-by-case basis		X			
Greater sage-grouse nesting area (with 2-mile buffer)	2/1–7/31	X				
Greater sage-grouse potential nesting habitat (up to 1 mile)	3/15–7/15		X			
Greater sage-grouse potential nesting habitat (up to 2 miles)	3/15–7/15				X	
Greater sage-grouse potential nesting habitat	3/15–7/15					X
Greater sage-grouse winter concentration areas	11/15–4/30	X				
Greater sage-grouse winter range	11/15–3/15				X	X
Mountain plover aggregation areas	4/10–7/10		X			
Mountain plover aggregation areas (with ¼-mile buffer)	4/10–7/10			X	X	X
Big game crucial habitat (winter range)	11/15–4/30	X		X	X	X
Big game birthing areas	5/1–6/30	X			X	X
Raptor nesting sites (with ½- to 1-mile buffer)	2/1–7/31	X			X	X
Raptor nesting sites (with ¼-mile buffer)	2/1–7/31		X			
Game and special status fish species	Spawning (species dependent)	X		X	X	X

Table 2-3. Wildlife Limitations by Alternative (Continued)

CONTROLLED SURFACE USE						
Greater sage-grouse leks (with ¼-mile buffer)	N/A	X	X			X
Greater sage-grouse potential nesting habitat	N/A					X
Raptor nesting sites (with ½- to 1-mile buffer)	N/A	X		X	X	X
NO SURFACE OCCUPANCY						
Greater sage-grouse nesting areas (with ½-mile buffer)	N/A				X	
Greater sage-grouse concentration areas	N/A			X		
Greater sage-grouse winter range	N/A			X		
Big game birthing areas	N/A			X		
Raptor nest sites (active)	N/A	X		X	X	X

Table 2-4. Summary of Impacts

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO LAND AND WATER RESOURCES

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO FIRE MANAGEMENT				
Fire Management Beneficial impacts from actions aimed at reducing fire frequency, size, and intensity.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be slightly reduced because of actions requiring limited fire suppression activities (rather than full suppression).	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Beneficial impacts from actions aimed at reducing fire frequency, size, and intensity.
Watershed Resources Management No net impact	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: No net impact
Wild Horse Management Beneficial and/or adverse impacts from the reduction (via browsing) of fine fuels.	Same as No Action Alternative	Potential impacts within the planning area would be eliminated because of the exclusion of the planning area from the HMA.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts could be greater because of the greater herd distribution resulting from expansion of the HMA.	Same as No Action Alternative: Beneficial and/or adverse impacts from the reduction (via browsing) of fine fuels.
Livestock Grazing Management Beneficial and/or adverse impacts from the reduction (via grazing) of fine fuels.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be greater because of anticipated increases in livestock grazing.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Beneficial and/or adverse impacts from the reduction (via grazing) of fine fuels.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Vegetation Management Beneficial impacts from maintaining diverse vegetation communities. Potential adverse impacts from prescribed burn stipulations, fire suppression restrictions, and allowance of the natural accumulation of fuels.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Beneficial impacts from maintaining diverse vegetation communities. Potential adverse impacts from prescribed burn stipulations, fire suppression restrictions, and allowance of the natural accumulation of fuels.
Wildlife Habitat Management Beneficial impacts from maintaining diverse vegetation communities. Potential adverse impacts from fire suppression restrictions and allowance of the natural accumulation of fuels.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Beneficial impacts from maintaining diverse vegetation communities. Potential adverse impacts from fire suppression restrictions and allowance of the natural accumulation of fuels.
Heritage Resources Management Adverse impacts from restrictions on fire suppression activities on or near heritage sites and from additional protection measures required for heritage resources during prescribed burns.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Adverse impacts from restrictions on fire suppression activities on or near heritage sites and from additional protection measures required for heritage resources during prescribed burns.
Recreation Management Adverse impacts from increased fire frequency caused by escaped campfires and OHV-ignited fires.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be least intensive under this alternative because of camping restrictions and OHV use limitations.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be reduced because of camping restrictions and OHV use limitations	Same as No Action Alternative: Adverse impacts from increased fire frequency caused by escaped campfires and OHV-ignited fires.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Mineral Resources Management Adverse impacts from increased fire frequency caused by an increased number of ignition sources.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be greatest under this alternative because of increased potential for mineral development.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be least intensive under this alternative because of decreased potential for mineral development.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be slightly less because of an anticipated decrease in well development.	Adverse impacts from increased fire frequency caused by an increased number of ignition sources. Impacts would be similar to, but potentially greater in the short term, than Alternative 3 as a result of implementation of the fluid mineral leasing strategy (Appendix 17).
Special Management Area and Other Management Area Management Adverse impacts because of fire suppression restrictions within these areas.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be reduced because of the elimination of management actions associated with removing special management area designations.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be greatest under this alternative as a result of implementation of management actions associated with expansion and addition of special management areas.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be slightly greater as result of implementation of management actions associated with expansion and addition of special management areas.	Adverse impacts because of fire suppression restrictions within these areas. Impacts would be slightly greater than the No Action Alternative as a result of implementation of management actions associated with expansion and addition of special management areas and other management areas.
Fire Management Short-term, adverse impacts from vegetation removal associated with prescribed burns and suppression activities. Long-term beneficial impacts from enhancing vegetative conditions.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be lessened because of reduced suppression efforts (limited suppression versus full suppression for basin big sagebrush/lemon scurfpea vegetation associations) and elimination of prescribed burning.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Short-term, adverse impacts from vegetation removal associated with prescribed burns and suppression activities. Long-term beneficial impacts from enhancing vegetative conditions.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Watershed Management Beneficial impacts from restoration and enhancement efforts, placement of buffer zones around riparian areas and floodplains, and restrictions on surface disturbing activities.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be reduced because of fewer restrictions on surface disturbing activities and smaller buffer zones around riparian areas and floodplains.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be greatest under this alternative because of increased restrictions on surface disturbing activities and larger buffer zones around riparian areas and floodplains.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be greater because of increased restrictions on surface disturbing activities and larger buffer zones around riparian areas and floodplains.	Same as No Action Alternative: Beneficial impacts from restoration and enhancement efforts, placement of buffer zones around riparian areas, and floodplains, and restrictions on surface disturbing activities.
Wild Horse Management Minimal adverse impacts from trampling of riparian vegetation and subsequent erosion. Maintaining the appropriate management level would help minimize impacts.	Same as No Action Alternative	Potential impacts within the planning area would be eliminated as a result of the exclusion of the planning area from the HMA.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be reduced on the current HMA because of the greater distribution of the herd; impacts could be greater on the expanded portion of the HMA.	Same as No Action Alternative: Minimal adverse impacts from trampling of riparian vegetation and subsequent erosion. Maintaining the appropriate management level would help minimize impacts.
Livestock Grazing Management Adverse impacts from vegetation removal, soil compaction, and stream bank instability. Implementing Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands would prevent impacts from becoming significant.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be greatest under this alternative because of reduced restrictions on grazing management and anticipated increases in livestock grazing.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be least intensive under this alternative because of greater restrictions on grazing management.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be slightly reduced because of greater restrictions on grazing management.	Same as No Action Alternative: Adverse impacts from vegetation removal, soil compaction, and stream bank instability. Implementing Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands would prevent impacts from becoming significant.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Vegetation Management Overall beneficial impacts from enhancement and protection of vegetation resources. Short-term, adverse impacts from vegetation treatments.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be slightly reduced because of fewer protections afforded to special status plant species.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Overall beneficial impacts from enhancement and protection of vegetation resources. Short-term, adverse impacts from vegetation treatments.
Wildlife Habitat Management Beneficial impacts from enhancement of wildlife habitat, which promotes healthy plant communities.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be reduced because of less restrictive actions to improve wildlife habitat.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be greater because of more restrictive actions to improve wildlife habitat.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be slightly greater because of more restrictive actions to improve wildlife habitat.	Beneficial impacts from enhancement of wildlife habitat, which promotes healthy plant communities. Beneficial impacts would be greater than under the No Action Alternative because of expanded protection measures for greater sage-grouse habitat.
Heritage Resources Management Adverse impacts from surface disturbing excavations. Beneficial impacts because of limitations on surface disturbance near heritage sites.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be greater because of increased limitations on surface disturbance near heritage sites.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Adverse impacts from surface disturbing excavations. Beneficial impacts because of limitations on surface disturbance near heritage sites.
Recreation Management Adverse impacts (erosion, soil compaction, sedimentation) from OHV use and camping activities within riparian corridors.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be reduced because of camping restrictions and increased OHV use limitations.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be slightly reduced because of camping restrictions and increased OHV use limitations.	Same as No Action Alternative: Adverse impacts (erosion, soil compaction, sedimentation) from OHV use and camping activities within riparian corridors.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Mineral Resources Management Adverse impacts (erosion, sedimentation, stream bank instability) from related construction activities (e.g., well pads, access roads). Following management prescriptions could help to reduce adverse impacts.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be greatest under this alternative because of increased potential for mineral development.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be least extensive under this alternative because of decreased potential for mineral development.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be greater under this alternative because of increased potential for mineral development.	Adverse impacts (erosion, sedimentation, stream bank instability) from related construction activities (e.g., well pads, access roads). Following management prescriptions could help to reduce adverse impacts. Impacts would be similar to, but potentially greater in the short term, than Alternative 3 as a result of implementation of the fluid mineral leasing strategy (Appendix 17).
Special Management Area and Other Management Area Management Beneficial impacts from limitations placed on surface disturbing activities within special management areas and other management areas.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be reduced because of the elimination of management actions associated with removing special management area designations.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be greatest under this alternative as a result of implementation of management actions associated with expansion and addition of special management areas.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be slightly greater as a result of implementation of management actions associated with expansion and addition of special management areas.	Beneficial impacts from limitations placed on surface disturbing activities within special management areas. Beneficial impacts would be slightly greater than the No Action Alternative as a result of implementation of management actions associated with expansion and addition of special management areas and other management areas.
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO WILD HORSES				
Fire Management Short-term, adverse impacts from forage removal. Long-term beneficial impacts from enhanced forage conditions.	Same as No Action Alternative	Potential impacts within the planning area would be eliminated as a result of the exclusion of the planning area from the HMA.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Short-term, adverse impacts from forage removal. Long-term beneficial impacts from enhanced forage conditions.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Watershed Management Beneficial impacts from actions aimed at maintaining and enhancing vegetative conditions.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts could be reduced because of less restrictive watershed management actions (e.g., smaller buffer zones around riparian areas and floodplains).	Potential impacts within the planning area would be eliminated as a result of the exclusion of the planning area from the HMA.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts could be greater because of more restrictive watershed management actions (e.g., larger buffer zones around riparian areas and floodplains).	Same as No Action Alternative: Beneficial impacts from actions aimed at maintaining and enhancing vegetative conditions.
Wild Horse Management Beneficial impacts from enhanced forage conditions as a result of maintenance of the appropriate management level and promoting herd distribution.	Same as No Action Alternative	Potential impacts within the planning area would be eliminated as a result of the exclusion of the planning area from the HMA.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts could be greater because of improved herd distribution.	Same as No Action Alternative: Beneficial impacts from enhanced forage conditions as a result of maintenance of the appropriate management level and promoting herd distribution.
Livestock Grazing Management Beneficial impacts from compliance with healthy rangeland standards, thereby improving forage conditions. Potential adverse impacts from competition for forage resources.	Same as No Action Alternative, except adverse impacts would be greater because of anticipated increases in livestock grazing.	Potential impacts within the planning area would be eliminated as a result of the exclusion of the planning area from the HMA.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Beneficial impacts from compliance with healthy rangeland standards, thereby improving forage conditions. Potential adverse impacts from competition for forage resources.
Vegetation Management Beneficial impacts from enhancement and protection of vegetation resources. Short-term, adverse impacts from vegetation treatments.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be slightly reduced because of fewer protections afforded to special status plant species.	Potential impacts within the planning area would be eliminated as a result of the exclusion of the planning area from the HMA.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Beneficial impacts from enhancement and protection of vegetation resources. Short-term, adverse impacts from vegetation treatments.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Wildlife Habitat Management Beneficial impacts from enhancement of wildlife habitat, which promotes healthy plant communities.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be reduced because of less restrictive actions to improve wildlife habitat.	Potential impacts within the planning area would be eliminated as a result of the exclusion of the planning area from the HMA.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be slightly greater because of more restrictive actions to improve wildlife habitat.	Beneficial impacts from enhancement of wildlife habitat, which promotes healthy plant communities. Beneficial impacts would be greater than under the No Action Alternative because of expanded protection measures for greater sage-grouse habitat.
Heritage Resources Management Minimal adverse impacts from surface disturbing excavations and limitations on range improvements near heritage sites. Potential beneficial impacts from limitations on surface disturbance near heritage sites.	Same as No Action Alternative	Potential impacts within the planning area would be eliminated as a result of the exclusion of the planning area from the HMA.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be slightly greater because of increased limitations on surface disturbance near heritage sites.	Same as No Action Alternative: Minimal adverse impacts from surface disturbing excavations and because of limitations on range improvements near heritage sites. Potential beneficial impacts from limitations on surface disturbance near heritage sites.
Recreation Management Minimal adverse impacts from forage removal associated with dispersed recreation. Potentially greater adverse impacts from OHV use.	Same as No Action Alternative	Potential impacts within the planning area would be eliminated because of the exclusion of the planning area from the HMA.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be slightly reduced because of increased OHV use limitations.	Same as No Action Alternative: Minimal adverse impacts from forage removal associated with dispersed recreation. Potentially greater adverse impacts from OHV use.
Mineral Resources Management Adverse impacts from vegetation removal associated with construction of well pads and connector roads.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be greatest under this alternative because of the increased potential for mineral development.	Potential impacts within the planning area would be eliminated because of the exclusion of the planning area from the HMA.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be greater under this alternative because of the increased potential for mineral development.	Adverse impacts from vegetation removal associated with construction of well pads and connector roads. Impacts would be similar to, but potentially greater in the short term, than Alternative 3 as a result of implementation of the fluid mineral leasing strategy (Appendix 17).

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Special Management Area and Other Management Area Management Beneficial impacts because of limitations placed on surface disturbing activities within special management areas and other management areas.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be reduced because of the elimination of management actions associated with removing special management area designations.	Potential impacts within the planning area would be eliminated because of the exclusion of the planning area from the HMA.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be slightly greater as a result of implementation of management actions associated with expansion and addition of special management areas.	Beneficial impacts because of limitations placed on surface disturbing activities within special management areas. Beneficial impacts would be greater than the No Action Alternative as a result of implementation of management actions associated with expansion and addition of special management areas and other management areas.
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO LIVESTOCK GRAZING				
Fire Management Short-term, adverse impacts from forage removal. Long-term beneficial impacts from enhanced forage conditions.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Short-term, adverse impacts from forage removal. Long-term beneficial impacts from enhanced forage conditions.
Watershed Management Beneficial impacts from actions aimed at maintaining and enhancing vegetative conditions.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts could be reduced because of less restrictive watershed management actions (e.g., smaller buffer zones around riparian areas and floodplains).	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts could be greater because of more restrictive watershed management actions (e.g., larger buffer zones around riparian areas and floodplains).	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts could be greater because of more restrictive watershed management actions (e.g., larger buffer zones around riparian areas and floodplains).	Same as No Action Alternative: Beneficial impacts from actions aimed at maintaining and enhancing vegetative conditions.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Wild Horse Management Adverse impacts from competition for forage resources. Maintaining the appropriate management level would help minimize impacts.	Same as No Action Alternative	Beneficial impacts from elimination of wild horses from the planning area. Adverse impacts from limiting livestock use within allotments affected by wild horse fence construction. Certain allotments would be subdivided by construction of a fence designed to limit wild horse movement to the reestablished HMA boundary.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts could be reduced as a result of better distribution of wild horses. Adverse impacts could also be greater as a result of wild horse grazing within the expanded portion of the HMA.	Same as No Action Alternative: Adverse impacts from competition for forage resources. Maintaining the appropriate management level would help minimize impacts.
Livestock Grazing Management Short-term, adverse impacts from adjusting grazing plans to comply with healthy rangelands standards and grazing restrictions. Potential long-term, beneficial impacts from increased forage production and subsequent livestock growth rates.	Same as No Action Alternative, except adverse impacts would be reduced because of increased flexibility in managing livestock resources. Beneficial impacts could also potentially be reduced as a result of increases in grazing pressures on forage resources.	Same as No Action Alternative, except adverse impacts would be greater because of increased restrictions on grazing activities. Beneficial impacts could be greater as a result of enhanced forage conditions.	Same as No Action Alternative, except adverse impacts would be slightly greater because of increased restrictions on grazing activities. Beneficial impacts could be slightly greater as a result of enhanced forage conditions.	Same as No Action Alternative: Short-term, adverse impacts from adjusting grazing plans to comply with healthy rangelands standards and grazing restrictions. Potential long-term, beneficial impacts from increased forage production and subsequent livestock growth rates.
Vegetation Management Beneficial impacts from enhancement and protection of vegetation resources. Short-term, adverse impacts from vegetation treatments.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be slightly reduced because of fewer protections afforded to special status plant species.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Beneficial impacts from enhancement and protection of vegetation resources. Short-term, adverse impacts from vegetation treatments.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Wildlife Habitat Management Beneficial impacts from enhancement of wildlife habitat, which promotes healthy plant communities. Potential adverse impacts from competition for forage resources.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be reduced because of less restrictive actions to improve wildlife habitat. The potential for adverse impacts would be greater because of increased competition for forage resources.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be greater because of more restrictive actions to improve wildlife habitat. The potential for adverse impacts would be slightly greater because of increased competition for forage resources.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be slightly greater because of more restrictive actions to improve wildlife habitat. The potential for adverse impacts would be slightly greater because of increased competition for forage resources.	Beneficial impacts from enhancement of wildlife habitat, which promotes healthy plant communities. Potential adverse impacts from competition for forage resources. The potential for adverse impacts would be slightly greater than the No Action Alternative as a result of increased competition for forage resources. Beneficial impacts would also likely be greater than under the No Action Alternative because of expanded protection measures for greater sage-grouse.
Heritage Resources Management Minimal adverse impacts from surface disturbing excavations and limitations on range improvements near heritage sites. Potential beneficial impacts from limitations on surface disturbance near heritage sites.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be greater because of increased limitations on surface disturbance near heritage sites.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be slightly greater because of increased limitations on surface disturbance near heritage sites.	Same as No Action Alternative: Minimal adverse impacts from surface disturbing excavations and limitations on range improvements near heritage sites. Potential beneficial impacts from limitations on surface disturbance near heritage sites.
Recreation Management Minimal adverse impacts from forage removal associated with dispersed recreation. Potentially greater adverse impacts from OHV use.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be reduced because of increased OHV use limitations.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be slightly reduced because of increased OHV use limitations.	Same as No Action Alternative: Minimal adverse impacts from forage removal associated with dispersed recreation. Potentially greater adverse impacts from OHV use.
Mineral Resources Management Adverse impacts from vegetation removal associated with construction of well pads and connector roads.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be greatest under this alternative because of the increased potential for mineral development.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be least extensive under this alternative because of the decreased potential for mineral development.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be greater under this alternative because of the increased potential for mineral development.	Adverse impacts from vegetation removal associated with construction of well pads and connector roads. Impacts would be similar to, but potentially greater in the short term, than Alternative 3 as a result of implementation of the fluid mineral leasing strategy (Appendix 17).

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Special Management Area and Other Management Area Management Beneficial impacts from limitations placed on surface disturbing activities within special management areas and other management areas.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be reduced because of the elimination of management actions associated with removing special management area designations.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be greatest under this alternative as a result of implementation of management actions associated with expansion and addition of special management areas.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be slightly greater as a result of implementation of management actions associated with expansion and addition of special management areas.	Beneficial impacts from limitations placed on surface disturbing activities within special management areas. Beneficial impacts would be slightly greater than the No Action Alternative as a result of implementation of management actions associated with expansion and addition of special management areas and other management areas.
Fire Management Short-term adverse impacts from vegetation removal. Long-term beneficial impacts from enhancement of vegetation conditions and protection of special status and rare plant communities.	Same as No Action Alternative	Possible adverse impacts from reduction in vegetation treatments and not allowing full fire management in susceptible vegetation communities.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Short-term adverse impacts from vegetation removal. Long-term beneficial impacts from enhancement of vegetation conditions and protection of special status and rare plant communities.
Watershed Management Beneficial impacts from restoration and enhancement efforts, placement of buffer zones around riparian areas and floodplains, and restrictions on surface disturbing activities.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be reduced because of fewer restrictions on surface disturbing activities and smaller buffer zones around riparian areas and floodplains.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be greatest under this alternative because of increased restrictions on surface disturbing activities and larger buffer zones around riparian areas and floodplains.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be greater because of increased restrictions on surface disturbing activities and larger buffer zones around riparian areas and floodplains.	Same as No Action Alternative: Beneficial impacts from restoration and enhancement efforts, placement of buffer zones around riparian areas and floodplains, and restrictions on surface disturbing activities.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Wild Horse Management Minimal, localized adverse impacts from grazing and competition for forage resources with wildlife and livestock. Maintaining the appropriate management level would help minimize impacts.	Same as No Action Alternative	Potential impacts within the planning area would be eliminated because of the exclusion of the planning area from the HMA.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be reduced because of the greater herd distribution achieved by expanding the Divide Basin Wild Horse Herd Management Area to cover the entire planning area.	Same as No Action Alternative: Minimal, localized adverse impacts from grazing and competition for forage resources with wildlife and livestock. Maintaining the appropriate management level would help minimize impacts.
Livestock Grazing Management Adverse impacts from vegetation removal, soil compaction, season-long grazing, and localized forage competition and overuse. Implementing healthy rangeland standards and guidelines for livestock grazing would prevent impacts from becoming significant.	Same as No Action Alternative, except adverse impacts would be greatest under this alternative because of increased grazing activity and less restrictive measures for range improvements and water developments.	Same as No Action Alternative, except adverse impacts would be less because of increased restrictions on livestock grazing activities.	Same as No Action Alternative.	Same as No Action Alternative: Adverse impacts from vegetation removal, soil compaction, season-long grazing, and localized forage competition and overuse. Implementing healthy rangeland standards and guidelines for livestock grazing would prevent impacts from becoming significant.
Heritage Resources Management Beneficial impacts through indirect preservation of rare and sensitive plant communities as well as general vegetative characteristics.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Beneficial impacts through indirect preservation of rare and sensitive plant communities as well as general vegetative characteristics

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Travel, Access, and Realty Management Adverse impacts from damage and loss of vegetation and noxious weed invasion as a result of unauthorized use of OHVs. Beneficial impacts to special status plants from ROW limitations.	Same as No Action Alternative, except adverse impacts would be greater because of decreased restrictions on use and increased development.	Same as No Action Alternative, except adverse effects would be less because of increased restrictions on use, decreased development, and the development of a transportation plan specific to the planning area.	Same as No Action Alternative, except adverse effects would be slightly less because of increased restrictions on use, decreased development, and the development of a transportation plan specific to the planning area.	Adverse impacts from damage and loss of vegetation and noxious weed invasion as a result of unauthorized use of OHVs. Beneficial impacts to special status plants from ROW limitations. The adverse impacts would be less than the No Action Alternative because of increased restrictions on use and the development of a transportation plan specific to the planning area.
Recreation Management Adverse impacts from damage and loss of vegetation and noxious weed invasion as a result of concentrated recreational activity such as camping and recreational mining.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be greater because of fewer restrictions on use and increased development.	Same as No Action Alternative, except adverse effects would be less because of increased restrictions on use.	Same as No Action Alternative, except adverse effects would be slightly less because of increased restrictions on use and limiting recreational mining to a 5-acre site.	Same as No Action Alternative: Adverse impacts from damage and loss of vegetation and noxious weed invasion as a result of concentrated recreational activity such as camping and recreational mining.
Mineral Resources Management Adverse, short-term or long-term impacts from vegetation loss and noxious weed invasion as a result of related surface disturbing activities. Term of impacts is dependent on the success of reclamation efforts in disturbed areas. May affect, but will not adversely affect threatened and endangered species.	Same as No Action Alternative, except adverse impacts would be greater because of decreased restrictions on use and increased development. Potential significant impacts to BLM sensitive species because of the lack of protection from fluid mineral and geophysical activities and coal and sodium exploration.	Same as No Action Alternative, except adverse impacts would be greatly reduced because of increased restrictions on use and closure of planning area to the majority of mineral development activities, thereby allowing vegetation to recover.	Same as No Action Alternative, except adverse impacts would be reduced because of increased restrictions on use and opportunity to implement an adaptive management strategy to control timing of development.	Adverse, short-term or long-term impacts from vegetation loss and noxious weed invasion as a result of related surface disturbing activities. Term of impacts is dependent on the success of reclamation efforts in disturbed areas. Adverse impacts would be reduced by the " no lease" prescription for fluid minerals in a portion of the planning area and the ability to apply Conditions of Approval to existing leases that do not offer protection for special status plant species. May affect, but will not adversely affect threatened and endangered species.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Special Management Area and Other Management Area Management Long-term beneficial impacts from conservation of sensitive vegetation communities and limitations on surface disturbing activities.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be reduced by removal of ACEC designation from Steamboat Mountain and decreasing the viewshed associated with the South Pass Historic Landscape.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be much greater from expansion of the Steamboat Mountain, Greater Sand Dunes, and Special Status Plants ACECs, and the addition of the Cushion Plant Community ACEC and the Pinnacles Geologic Feature ACEC.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be much greater from expansion of the Steamboat Mountain, Greater Sand Dunes, and Special Status Plants ACECs, and the addition of the Cushion Plant Community ACEC.	Long-term beneficial impacts from conservation of sensitive vegetation communities and limitations on surface disturbing activities. Beneficial impacts would be greater than the No Action Alternative because of the expansion of the Steamboat Mountain ACEC and the addition of the West Sand Dunes Archaeological District, Steamboat Mountain Management Area, and protection of the Pinnacles Geologic Feature.
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO WILDLIFE HABITAT				
General Land and Water Resources Management Beneficial impacts or no net impact because of restrictions and protections associated with managing land and water resources.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be least extensive under this alternative because of reduced restrictions associated with uses of land and water resources.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be greatest under this alternative because of increased restrictions associated with uses of land and water resources.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Beneficial impacts or no net impact because of restrictions and protections associated with managing land and water resources.
Fire Management Adverse impacts from loss of cover from vegetation removal. Beneficial impacts from enhancing vegetation conditions.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be less because prescribed fire is not considered under this alternative.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Adverse impacts from loss of cover from vegetation removal. Beneficial impacts from enhancing vegetation conditions.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Watershed Management Beneficial impacts from restoration and enhancement efforts, restrictions on surface disturbing activities, and placement of buffer zones around riparian areas and floodplains.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be reduced because of fewer restrictions on surface disturbing activities and smaller buffer zones around riparian areas and floodplains.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be greatest under this alternative because of increased restrictions on surface disturbing activities and larger buffer zones around riparian areas and floodplains.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be greater because of increased restrictions on surface disturbing activities and larger buffer zones around riparian areas and floodplains.	Same as No Action Alternative: Beneficial impacts from restoration and enhancement efforts, restrictions on surface disturbing activities, and placement of buffer zones around riparian areas and floodplains.
Wild Horse Management Minimal, adverse impacts from localized forage competition. Maintaining the appropriate management level would help minimize impacts.	Same as No Action Alternative	Potential impacts within the planning area would be eliminated as a result of the exclusion of the planning area from the HMA.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be reduced because of the greater herd distribution achieved by expanding the Divide Basin Wild Horse Herd Management Area to cover the entire planning area.	Same as No Action Alternative: Minimal, adverse impacts from localized forage competition. Maintaining the appropriate management level would help minimize impacts.
Livestock Grazing Management Adverse impacts from vegetation removal, soil compaction, season-long grazing, and localized forage competition and overuse. Implementing healthy rangeland standards and guidelines for livestock grazing would prevent impacts from becoming significant.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be greatest under this alternative because of increased grazing activity and less restrictive measures for range improvements and water developments.	Same as No Action Alternative, except adverse impacts would be least extensive under this alternative because of increased restrictions on livestock grazing activities.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Adverse impacts from vegetation removal, soil compaction, season-long grazing, and localized forage competition and overuse. Implementing healthy rangeland standards and guidelines for livestock grazing would prevent impacts from becoming significant.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Vegetation Management Beneficial impacts to sensitive species associated with special status plants.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be reduced because of fewer restrictions associated with special status plants.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Beneficial impacts to sensitive species associated with special status plants.
Heritage Resources Management Beneficial impacts through indirect preservation of habitat as well as general habitat characteristics.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Beneficial impacts through indirect preservation of habitat as well as general habitat characteristics.
Travel, Access, and Realty Management Adverse impacts from damage and loss of vegetation and noxious weed invasion as a result of unauthorized use of OHVs. Adverse impacts from increased access, human disturbance, and surface disturbing activities. Possible significant impacts if communication sites and related access routes were placed in or near sensitive habitats. Protections for sensitive habitats would reduce adverse impacts.	Same as No Action Alternative, except adverse impacts would be greater because of decreased restrictions on use and increased development.	Same as No Action Alternative, except adverse effects would be less because of increased restrictions on use, decreased development, and the development of a transportation plan specific to the planning area.	Same as No Action Alternative, except adverse effects would be slightly less because of increased restrictions on use, decreased development, and the development of a transportation plan specific to the planning area.	Adverse impacts from damage and loss of vegetation and noxious weed invasion as a result of unauthorized use of OHVs. Adverse impacts from increased access, human disturbance, and surface disturbing activities. Possible significant impacts if communication sites or related access routes were placed in or near sensitive habitat. Adverse effects would be less because of development of a transportation plan specific to the planning area. Protections for sensitive habitats would also reduce adverse impacts.
Recreation Management Temporary, adverse impacts because of increased human disturbance.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative, except adverse effects would be less because of increased restrictions on use.	Same as No Action Alternative, except adverse effects would be less because of increased restrictions on use.	Same as No Action Alternative: Temporary, adverse impacts because of increased human disturbance.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Mineral Resources Management Adverse impacts from associated surface disturbing and disruptive activity. Protections placed on sensitive habitats would reduce adverse impacts. Significance of adverse impacts is undetermined based on unknown location and timing of development activities.	Same as No Action Alternative, except adverse impacts would be significant under this alternative because of decreased restrictions on use and increased development.	Same as No Action Alternative, except adverse impacts would be least extensive under this alternative because of increased restrictions on use and closure of the planning area to the majority of mineral development activities.	Same as No Action Alternative, except adverse impacts would be reduced because of increased restrictions on use and opportunity to implement an adaptive management strategy to control timing of development.	Potentially significant adverse impacts, depending on the amount, timing, and duration of activity, from associated surface disturbing and disruptive activity on existing leases. Adverse impacts would be reduced by closing portions of the planning area to fluid mineral leasing and the ability to apply Conditions of Approval to existing leases that do not offer protection for wildlife resources.
Special Management Area and Other Management Area Management Long-term beneficial impacts from conservation and enhancement of sensitive habitat and limitations on surface disturbing activities.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be reduced by removal of the ACEC designation from Steamboat Mountain.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be much greater from expansion of the Steamboat Mountain, Greater Sand Dunes, and Special Status Plants ACECs, and the addition of the Cushion Plant Community ACEC and the Pinnacles Geologic Feature ACEC.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be much greater from expansion of the Steamboat Mountain, Greater Sand Dunes, and Special Status Plants ACECs, and the addition of the Cushion Plant Community ACEC.	Long-term beneficial impacts from conservation of sensitive vegetation communities and limitations on surface disturbing activities. Beneficial impacts would increase as a result of the expansion of Steamboat Mountain ACEC, protection of the Pinnacles Geologic Feature, and the addition of the West Sand Dunes Archeological District and Steamboat Mountain Management Area.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO HERITAGE RESOURCES				
Land and Water Resources Management Beneficial impacts because of restrictions on surface disturbing and disruptive activities to protect water, vegetation, and wildlife resources.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be least extensive under this alternative because of fewer restrictions on surface disturbing and disruptive activities.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be greatest under this alternative because of increased restrictions on surface disturbing and disruptive activities.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be slightly greater because of increased restrictions on surface disturbing and disruptive activities.	Beneficial impacts because of restrictions on surface disturbing and disruptive activities to protect water, vegetation, and wildlife resources. Beneficial impacts would be slightly greater than under the No Action Alternative because of increased restrictions on surface disturbing and disruptive activities.
Travel, Access, and Realty Management Adverse impacts from increased access, human disturbance, surface disturbing activities, and unauthorized OHV use. Absence of a transportation plan could maintain impacts.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative, except adverse effects would be less because of increased restrictions on use, decreased development, and the development of a transportation plan specific to the planning area.	Same as No Action Alternative, except adverse effects would be slightly less because of increased restrictions on use, decreased development, and the development of a transportation plan specific to the planning area.	Adverse impacts from increased access, human disturbance, surface disturbing activities, and unauthorized OHV use. Impacts could be reduced as a result of the implementation of a transportation plan specific to the planning area.
Recreation Management Indirect, adverse impacts from human disturbance. Beneficial impacts as a result of implementation of public education and interpretive programs that encourage protection of heritage resources. Expansion of the Greater Sand Dunes Recreation Area parking lot and camping facilities could increase adverse impacts.	Same as No Action Alternative, except adverse impacts could be slightly reduced as a result of not expanding the Greater Sand Dunes Recreation Area parking lot and camping facilities.	Same as No Action Alternative, except adverse impacts could be reduced because of increased restrictions on use and as a result of not expanding the Greater Sand Dunes Recreation Area parking lot and camping facilities.	Same as No Action Alternative, except adverse impacts could be slightly reduced because of increased restrictions on use and as a result of not expanding the Greater Sand Dunes Recreation Area parking area and camping facilities.	Same as No Action Alternative: Indirect, adverse impacts from human disturbance. Beneficial impacts as a result of implementation of public education and interpretive programs that encourage protection of heritage resources. Expansion of the Greater Sand Dunes Recreation Area parking lot and camping facilities could increase adverse impacts.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Mineral Resources Management Adverse impacts from potential surface disturbance over approximately 1,800 acres. Pre-authorization inventory and avoidance would help to minimize impacts.	Adverse impacts from potential surface disturbance over approximately 2,100 acres. Pre-authorization inventory and avoidance would help to minimize impacts.	Adverse impacts from potential surface disturbance over approximately 1,300 acres. Pre-authorization inventory and avoidance would help to minimize impacts.	Adverse impacts from potential surface disturbance over approximately 1,600 acres. Pre-authorization inventory and avoidance would help to minimize impacts.	Same as Alternative 3: Adverse impacts from potential surface disturbance over approximately 1,600 acres. Pre-authorization inventory and avoidance would help to minimize impacts.
Visual Resources Management Beneficial impacts by prohibiting surface disturbing and construction activities in certain areas that might contain heritage resources. Viewsheds and historic resources located within higher VRM classifications could be adversely affected.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be reduced as a result of issuance of less restrictive VRM classifications over larger areas.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be greatest under this alternative as a result of issuance of more restrictive VRM classifications over larger areas.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts could be slightly greater as a result of issuance of more restrictive VRM classifications over larger areas.	Beneficial impacts by prohibiting surface disturbing and construction activities in certain areas that might contain heritage resources. Viewsheds and historic resources located within higher VRM classifications could be adversely affected. Beneficial impacts would be slightly greater than the No Action Alternative as a result of issuance of more restrictive VRM classifications over larger areas.
Special Management Area and Other Management Area Management Beneficial impacts from the protections and management prescriptions applied to special management areas and other management areas.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be least extensive under this alternative because of the elimination of management actions associated with removing special management area designation from Steamboat Mountain ACEC.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be greatest under this alternative as a result of implementation of management actions associated with expansion and designation of special management areas.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be slightly greater as a result of implementation of management actions associated with expansion and designation of special management areas.	Beneficial impacts from the protections and management prescriptions applied to special management areas. Impacts would be slightly greater than under the No Action Alternative as a result of implementation of management actions associated with the expansion of the Steamboat Mountain ACEC and the addition of the West Sand Dunes Archaeological District, Steamboat Mountain Management Area, and protection of the Pinnacles Geologic Feature.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO TRAVEL, ACCESS, AND REALTY				
Land and Water Resources Management Adverse impacts from restrictions on surface disturbing and disruptive activities to protect water, vegetation, and wildlife resources.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be least extensive under this alternative because of fewer restrictions on surface disturbing and disruptive activities.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be greatest under this alternative because of increased restrictions on surface disturbing and disruptive activities.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be slightly greater because of increased restrictions on surface disturbing and disruptive activities.	Adverse impacts from restrictions on surface disturbing and disruptive activities to protect water, vegetation, and wildlife resources. Impacts would be slightly greater than under the No Action Alternative because of increased restrictions on surface disturbing and disruptive activities.
Travel, Access, and Realty Management *Transportation Planning*: Beneficial impacts by providing for appropriate ingress, egress, and access routes.	Same as No Action Alternative	Beneficial and/or adverse impacts as a result of the development of a transportation plan that could facilitate and/or restrict travel, access, and realty actions. Adverse impacts would be greatest under this alternative because the plan would provide maximum protection for crucial habitats and sensitive resources.	Same as Alternative 2, except adverse impacts would be reduced because of less restrictive measures to protect crucial habitats and sensitive resources.	Beneficial and/or adverse impacts as a result of the development of a transportation plan that could facilitate and/or restrict travel, access, and realty actions. Adverse impacts would be slightly reduced compared with Alternative 3 because of less restrictive measures to protect crucial habitats and sensitive resources.
Geophysical: Placing restrictions on geophysical activities could adversely impact users.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be reduced because of fewer restrictions on geophysical activities.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be greatest under this alternative because of increased restrictions on geophysical activities.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be greater because of increased restrictions on geophysical activities.	Placing restrictions on geophysical activities could adversely impact users. Impacts could be slightly greater than the No Action Alternative because of increased restrictions on geophysical activities.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Rights-of-way: Placing restrictions (i.e., exclusion and avoidance areas) on rights-of-way activities could adversely impact users.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be reduced because of fewer restrictions on rights-of-way activities.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be greatest under this alternative because of increased restrictions on rights-of-way activities.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be greater because of increased restrictions on rights-of-way activities.	Placing restrictions (i.e., exclusion and avoidance areas) on rights-of-way activities could adversely impact users. Impacts could be slightly greater than the No Action Alternative because of increased restrictions on rights-of-way activities.
Off-Highway Vehicle Use: Minimal adverse impacts because of implementation of OHV use designations that would control and limit travel within the planning area.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be least extensive under this alternative because of less restrictive OHV use designations.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be greatest under this alternative because of more restrictive OHV use designations.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be slightly greater because of more restrictive OHV use designations.	Same as No Action Alternative: Minimal adverse impacts because of implementation of OHV use designations that would control and limit travel within the planning area.
Mineral Resources Management Beneficial impacts by increasing access and expanding transportation routes associated with mineral development.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be greatest under this alternative because more of the planning area would be open to mineral development.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be least extensive under this alternative because most of the planning area would be closed to mineral development.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be reduced because of increased restrictions on mineral development.	Beneficial impacts by increasing access and expanding transportation routes associated with mineral development. Beneficial impacts would be reduced compared with the No Action Alternative because of increased restrictions on mineral development.
Visual Resources Management Adverse impacts because of restrictions imposed by VRM classifications.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be reduced as a result of issuance of less restrictive VRM classifications over larger areas.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be greatest under this alternative as a result of issuance of more restrictive VRM classifications over larger areas.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts could be slightly greater under this alternative as a result of issuance of more restrictive VRM classifications over larger areas.	Adverse impacts because of restrictions imposed by VRM classifications. Impacts would be slightly greater than the No Action Alternative as a result of issuance of more restrictive VRM classifications over larger areas.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Fire Management No net impact	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: No net impact
Watershed Management Beneficial impacts from maintaining healthy watersheds, which enhance the recreational experience.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be reduced because of fewer restrictions on surface disturbing activities and smaller buffer zones around riparian areas and floodplains.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be greatest under this alternative because of increased restrictions on surface disturbing activities and larger buffer zones around riparian areas and floodplains.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be greater because of increased restrictions on surface disturbing activities and larger buffer zones around riparian areas and floodplains.	Same as No Action Alternative: Beneficial impacts from maintaining healthy watersheds, which enhance the recreational experience.
Wild Horse Management No net impact	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: No net impact
Livestock Grazing Management Minimal, adverse impacts from degradation of rangeland resources, especially within riparian areas.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts could be more extensive because of fewer restrictions on livestock management.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts could be less extensive because of increased restrictions on livestock management.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts could be less extensive because of increased restrictions on livestock management.	Same as No Action Alternative: Minimal, adverse impacts from degradation of rangeland resources, especially within riparian areas.
Vegetation Management Beneficial impacts from maintaining diverse vegetation communities, which enhance the recreational experience.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be reduced because of fewer protections afforded to special status plant species.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Beneficial impacts from maintaining diverse vegetation communities, which enhance the recreational experience.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Wildlife Habitat Management Beneficial impacts to users (including hunters) from protection of wildlife habitat. Temporary, adverse impacts because of limitations on seasonal use to protect sensitive plants and wildlife habitat.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be reduced with decreased habitat protection.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be greater with increased habitat protection.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be greater with increased habitat protection.	Beneficial impacts to users (including hunters) from protection of wildlife habitat. Temporary, adverse impacts because of limitations on seasonal use to protect sensitive plants and wildlife habitat. Beneficial impacts would be greater than the No Action Alternative because of increased habitat protection under the proposed implementation, monitoring and evaluation process.
Heritage Resources Management Beneficial impacts by providing users with interpretive materials on historical and cultural sites of interest.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Beneficial impacts by providing users with interpretive materials on historical and cultural sites of interest.
Travel, Access and Realty Management Existing roads and trails provide adequate vehicle access in the planning area for recreational purposes. The OHV designations and adherence to them would minimize adverse impacts on recreation resources by limiting disturbance to vegetation, watersheds, and wildlife.	Fewer restrictions on OHV use would benefit those recreationists that participate in OHV activities but could have adverse effects on users that prefer non-motorized forms of recreation.	Increased restrictions on OHV use could adversely affect OHV users but could have a beneficial effect on those recreationists that prefer non-motorized forms of recreation.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Existing roads and trails provide adequate vehicle access in the planning area for recreational purposes. The OHV designations and adherence to them would minimize adverse impacts on recreation resources by limiting disturbance to vegetation, watersheds, and wildlife.
Recreation Management Beneficial impacts as a result of management actions aimed at maintaining and improving recreation resources.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be reduced because of decreased recreational planning.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be greater because of increased recreational planning.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be greater because of increased recreational planning.	Beneficial impacts as a result of management actions aimed at maintaining and improving recreation resources. Beneficial impacts would be greater than the No Action Alternative because of increased recreational planning.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Mineral Resources Management Adverse impacts from degrading the overall recreational experience as a result of visual and auditory intrusions.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be greatest under this alternative because of the increased potential for mineral development.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be least extensive under this alternative because of the decreased potential for mineral development.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be reduced because of the decreased potential for mineral development.	Adverse impacts from degrading the overall recreational experience as a result of visual and auditory intrusions. Impacts would be reduced compared with the No Action Alternative because of the decreased potential for mineral development.
Visual Resources Management VRM classifications would have beneficial effects on the recreation resources and users by ensuring that surface disturbing activities would be compatible with the existing character of the landscape and that visual intrusions would not adversely affect the recreational experience.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be reduced as a result of issuance of less restrictive VRM classifications over larger areas.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be greatest under this alternative as a result of issuance of more restrictive VRM classifications over larger areas.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts could be slightly greater under this alternative as a result of issuance of more restrictive VRM classifications over larger areas.	Classifications would have beneficial effects on the recreation resources and users by ensuring that surface disturbing activities would be compatible with the existing character of the landscape and that visual intrusions would not adversely affect the recreational experience. Impacts would be slightly greater than the No Action Alternative as a result of issuance of more restrictive VRM classifications over larger areas.
Special Management Area and Other Management Area Management Beneficial impacts on recreational users by minimizing incompatible uses in special management areas and providing areas for solitude and primitive recreational opportunities.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be reduced because of the elimination of management actions associated with removing the special management area designation from Steamboat Mountain ACEC.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be greatest under this alternative as a result of implementation of management actions associated with expansion and additional of special management areas.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be slightly greater as a result of implementation of management actions associated with expansion and additional of special management areas.	Beneficial impacts on recreational users by minimizing incompatible uses in special management areas and providing areas for solitude and primitive recreational opportunities. Impacts would be slightly greater than the No Action Alternative as a result of implementation of management actions associated with the expansion of the Steamboat Mountain ACEC and the addition of the West Sand Dunes Archaeological District, Steamboat Mountain Management Area, and protection of the Pinnacles Geologic Feature.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO MINERAL AND ALTERNATIVE ENERGY RESOURCES				
Summary of Impacts to Fluid Minerals				
All Resource Categories with Mineral-Related Provisions or Restrictions Adverse impacts from the absence of the planning criteria needed for development of stipulations of oil and gas leases in the core area. Potential adverse impacts because of the lack of resource protection requirements for site-specific analyses for APDs needed for lease development.	Adverse impacts would be minimized as a result of management actions that would provide for the maximum amount of leasing and development allowable under existing laws and regulations.	Adverse impacts from discontinuation of leasing and development in all portions of the planning area with sensitive resources. Loss of potential, additional development on existing leases that were purchased from current leaseholders.	Adverse impacts as a result of stipulations on leasing and development activities where indicators of sensitive resources show that rates of development need to be controlled to prevent adverse impacts. Adverse impacts might also occur where surface use restrictions make development not economically viable.	Adverse impacts as a result of stipulations on leasing and development activities where indicators of sensitive resources show that rates of development need to be controlled to prevent adverse impacts. Leases placed in suspension would not be developed until the suspension was lifted, based on monitoring of sensitive resources to assess potential impacts. Adverse impacts might also occur where surface use restrictions make development not economically viable.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Summary of Impacts to Leasable Solid Minerals				
All Resource Categories with Mineral-Related Provisions or Restrictions Adverse impacts would occur from closing areas to leasing, including the WSAs and the western part of the Greater Sand Dunes ACEC. Surface use restrictions might make some coal resources not economically viable.	Adverse impacts would be minimized as a result of management actions that provided for increased leasing and development. Some impacts would occur because of mining restrictions within certain sensitive resource areas and because of requirements related to current laws and regulations.	Adverse impacts would include closing of federal coal lands within the Coal and Sodium Occurrence and Development Potential Area to future leasing and development	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Adverse impacts would occur from closing areas to leasing, including the WSAs and the western part of the Greater Sand Dunes ACEC. Surface use restrictions might make some coal resources not economically viable.
Summary of Impacts to Locatable Minerals				
All Resource Categories with Mineral-Related Provisions or Restrictions Adverse impacts as a result of withdrawals from locatable minerals specified in the Green River RMP. Adverse impacts would also occur for proposed mining claims where a required plan of operations caused mining to not be economically viable.	Minimal adverse impacts as a result of withdrawals from locatable minerals specified in the Green River RMP.	Adverse impacts as a result of withdrawing the planning area from filing of mineral claims, exploration, and development of locatable minerals, including recreational use mining activity. Impacts would include loss of current claims found not to be valid, and no new claims could be located in the planning area.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be slightly greater as a result of additional withdrawals. The northern elk calving areas and the potential diamond-bearing area of Steamboat Mountain ACEC would be withdrawn. Withdrawals would also be proposed for areas where general land use is classified as no surface occupancy.	Adverse impacts as a result of withdrawals from locatable minerals specified in the Green River RMP. Adverse impacts would also occur for proposed mining claims where a required plan of operations causes mining to not be economically viable. Impacts would be slightly greater than the No Action Alternative due to additional withdrawals. The northern elk calving areas and the potential diamond-bearing area of Steamboat Mountain ACEC would be withdrawn.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Summary of Impacts to Salable Minerals				
All Resource Categories with Mineral-Related Provisions or Restrictions Adverse impacts would include loss of salable mineral resources where such activity would cause unacceptable impacts. Requiring mining and reclamation plans and that management be in conformance with other resource objectives could make use of mineral materials not economically viable.	Same as No Action Alternative	Adverse impacts would include loss of the use of salable minerals due to closure of the planning area to mineral material sales. Such sales would only be allowed to meet other planning objectives.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be slightly greater as a result of additional closures. The lava rock portion of Steamboat Mountain would be closed to mineral material sales, which is the most desirable mineral material resource identified in the planning area. The area within ½ mile of greater sage-grouse leks would also be closed.	Adverse impacts would include loss of salable mineral resources where such activity would cause unacceptable impacts. Requiring mining and reclamation plans and that management be in conformance with other resource objectives could make use of mineral materials not economically viable. Impacts would be slightly greater than the No Action Alternative as a result of additional closures. The lava rock portion of Steamboat Mountain would be closed to mineral material sales, which is the most desirable mineral material resource identified in the planning area. The Pinnacles Geologic Feature would also be closed.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Summary of Impacts to Alternative Energy Resources				
All Resource Categories with Mineral-Related Provisions or Restrictions No net impact. Alternative energy development is not discussed or analyzed under the No Action Alternative (no related action in the Green River RMP).	Beneficial impacts by allowing for the maximum level of alternative energy resource development within the planning area.	Adverse impacts as a result of closure of the planning area to all alternative energy development proposals.	Beneficial impacts by allowing for alternative energy resource development within the planning area, except where such activity would cause unacceptable impacts to sensitive resources. Where favorable development conditions coexist with sensitive resources, the alternative would have a negative impact on alternative energy resources.	Same as Alternative 3: Beneficial impacts by allowing for alternative energy resource development within the planning area, except where such activity would cause unacceptable impacts to sensitive resources. Where favorable development conditions coexist with sensitive resources, this alternative would have a negative impact on alternative energy resources.
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO VISUAL RESOURCES				
Land and Water Resources Management Beneficial impacts from management actions that serve to maintain or enhance land and water resources. Possible adverse impacts from developments designed to facilitate management of land and water resources.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be least extensive and adverse impacts would be most extensive under this alternative because of less restrictive management actions and requirements for developments.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be most extensive and adverse impacts would be least extensive under this alternative because of more restrictive management actions and requirements for developments.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be increased and adverse impacts would be reduced because of more restrictive management actions and requirements for developments.	Beneficial impacts from management actions that serve to maintain or enhance land and water resources. Possible adverse impacts from developments designed to facilitate management of land and water resources. Beneficial impacts could be slightly increased and adverse impacts could be reduced compared with the No Action Alternative because of more restrictive management actions and requirements for developments.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Heritage Resources Management Beneficial impacts by enhancing the visual character of the planning area.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Beneficial impacts by enhancing the visual classification of the planning area.
Travel, Access, and Realty Management Adverse impacts from ROW construction activity, increased access, and vehicular travel. Impacts would be minimized by identifying and controlling highly traveled routes and providing for orderly development that would be compatible with VRM objectives. OHV use designations would reduce impacts related to this activity.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be least extensive under this alternative as a result of the implementation of a transportation plan and increased restrictions on ROWs and OHV use.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be least extensive under this alternative as a result of the implementation of a transportation plan and increased restrictions on ROWs and OHV use.	Adverse impacts from ROW construction activity, increased access, and vehicular travel. Impacts would be minimized by identifying and controlling highly traveled routes and providing for orderly development that would be compatible with VRM objectives. OHV use designations would reduce impacts related to this activity. Impacts would be reduced compared with the No Action Alternative as a result of implementation of a transportation plan and increased restrictions on ROWs.
Recreation Management No net impact on the visual character of the landscape. Increased recreational activity could potentially affect the scenic quality of localized areas that experience increased use. However, such impacts would likely be insignificant because these small areas would be closed if resource damage were to occur.	No net impact on the visual character of the landscape. The user could likely be affected by visual intrusions on the landscape that could occur in a majority of the planning area.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: No net impact on the visual character of the landscape. Increased recreational activity could potentially affect the scenic quality of localized areas that experience increased use. However, such impacts would likely be insignificant because these small areas would be closed if resource damage were to occur.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Mineral Resources Management Adverse impacts from surface disturbing activities that alter the visual characteristics of the landscape. Mitigation requirements and mineral withdrawals would help reduce impacts.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be slightly reduced because there would be less Class II land area with the change in VRM Class of the Steamboat Mountain area.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be reduced because of decreased potential for mineral development.	Same as No Action Alternative, except the significance of this impact would depend on the amount of development projected to occur on existing leases within Class I and Class II areas and the extent of mitigation (siting, painting, screening) applied to the proposed activity to protect scenic quality.	Adverse impacts from surface disturbing activities that alter the visual characteristics of the landscape. Mitigation requirements and mineral withdrawals would help reduce impacts. The significance of this impact would depend on the amount of development projected to occur on existing leases within Class I and Class II areas and the extent of mitigation (siting, painting, screening) applied to the proposed activity to protect scenic quality.
Special Management Area and Other Management Area Management Beneficial impacts on the visual character and scenic quality of the landscape as a result of VRM classifications assigned to special management areas and other management areas.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be slightly reduced because of a reduction in Class II designations.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be greatest because of increases in Class I and Class II designations.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be greater because of increases in Class I and Class II designations.	Beneficial impacts on the visual character and scenic quality of the landscape as a result of VRM classifications assigned to special management areas and other management areas. Beneficial impacts would be greater than the No Action Alternative because of an increase in Class II designations.
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREAS AND OTHER MANAGEMENT AREAS				
Land and Water Resources Management Beneficial impacts from limitations on surface disturbing activities, vegetation removal, and season of use, and modifications of action if necessary to be consistent with management prescriptions for special management areas and other management areas.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Beneficial impacts from limitations on surface disturbing activities, vegetation removal, and season of use, and modifications of action if necessary to be consistent with management prescriptions for special management areas and other management areas.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Heritage Resources Management Beneficial impacts through preservation of resources and indirect preservation of vegetation and wildlife habitat.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Beneficial impacts through preservation of resources and indirect preservation of vegetation and wildlife habitat.
Travel, Access, and Realty Management Beneficial impacts from identifying and controlling highly traveled routes, adhering to OHV designations, and providing orderly development.	Same as No Action Alternative, except beneficial impacts would be reduced because of decreased restrictions on use and increased development.	Same as No Action, except beneficial impacts would be increased because of increased restrictions on use, decreased development, and the development of a transportation plan specific to the planning area.	Same as No Action, except beneficial impacts would be increased because of increased restrictions on use, decreased development, and the development of a transportation plan specific to the planning area.	Beneficial impacts from identifying and controlling highly traveled routes, adhering to OHV designations, and providing orderly development. Beneficial impacts would be greater than the No Action Alternative because of increased restrictions on use, staged development, and the development of a transportation plan specific to the planning area.
Recreation Management Beneficial impacts from preparation of recreation site plans and recreation project plans.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Beneficial impacts from preparation of recreation site plans and recreation project plans.
Mineral Resources Management Adverse impacts from associated surface disturbing and disruptive activities. Implementing management prescriptions and interim management guidelines would prevent impacts from becoming significant.	Significant adverse impacts from associated surface disturbing activities. Implementing management prescriptions and interim management guidelines would reduce adverse impacts.	Same as No Action Alternative, except adverse impacts would be much less because of increased restrictions on use, expansion of special management areas, and closure of planning area to the majority of mineral development activities.	Same as No Action Alternative, except adverse impacts would be much less because of increased restrictions on use, expansion of special management areas, and closure of planning area to the majority of mineral development activities.	Adverse impacts from associated surface disturbing and disruptive activities. Adverse impacts would be less than the No Action Alternative because of increased restrictions and protection of the Pinnacles Geologic Feature. Implementing management prescriptions and interim management guidelines would prevent impacts from becoming significant.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Visual Resources Management Beneficial impacts through Class I and Class II designations on the majority of special management areas within the planning area.	Same as No Action Alternative	Beneficial impacts through Class I designations on all special management areas.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Beneficial impacts through Class I and Class II designations on the majority of special management areas within the planning area.
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO AIR RESOURCES				
All Resource Categories Impacts to air quality would include emissions from oil and gas development on existing leases in the planning area, development of new leases outside the core area, and operation of existing wells and compressors throughout the planning area. Vehicular and fire activity would also produce emissions that would degrade air quality and visibility.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be greater because of anticipated increases in mineral development and vehicular activity.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be substantially reduced because of increased restrictions on mineral development, prohibition of development of new leases within sensitive resource areas, and discontinuance of operation of certain wells and compressors through lease buy-backs.	Same as No Action Alternative, except impacts would be slightly reduced because of increased restrictions on mineral development and adaptive management measures that might impose timing requirements and cause certain leases to be suspended.	Impacts to air quality would include emissions from oil and gas development on existing leases in the planning area, development of new leases, and operation of existing wells and compressors throughout the planning area. Impacts would be reduced compared with the No Action Alternative because of increased restrictions on mineral development and closure of a portion of the planning area to new leasing.
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO SOCIOECONOMICS				
Fire Management No measurable impact	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: No measurable impact
Watershed Management No measurable impact	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: No measurable impact
Wild Horse Management No measurable impact	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: No measurable impact

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Livestock Grazing Management Increased economic benefits with the support, on average, of eight jobs per year and increased total earnings of $1.4 million over the 20-year study period.	Average annual jobs supported would increase to 16, and total earnings would increase to $2.7 million over the 20-year study period.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Increased economic benefits with the support, on average, of eight jobs per year and increased total earnings of $1.4 million over the 20-year study period.
Vegetation Management No measurable impact	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: No measurable impact
Wildlife Habitat Management Impacts analyzed under Recreation Management.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Impacts analyzed under Recreation Management.
Heritage Resources Management Impacts analyzed under Recreation Management.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Impacts analyzed under Recreation Management.
Recreation Management Increased economic benefits with the support, on average, of 23 jobs per year and increased total earnings of $3.4 million over the 20-year study period.	Slight decrease in average employment (22) and earnings ($3.3 million) from the No Action Alternative	Slight decrease in average employment (22) and total earnings ($3.3 million) from the No Action Alternative.	Slight decrease in average employment (20) and total earnings ($3.0 million) from the No Action Alternative.	Slight increase in employment and total earnings from the No Action Alternative.
Mineral Resources Management Increased economic benefits with the support, on average, of 128 jobs per year; increased total earnings by $53 million; and increased mineral tax revenues to $101 million.	Increase in potential average annual employment (148), total earnings ($59 million), and mineral tax revenues ($114 million) from the No Action Alternative.	Decrease in potential average annual employment (100), total earnings ($43 million), and mineral tax revenues ($85 million) from the No Action Alternative.	Decrease in potential average annual employment (121), total earnings ($51 million), and mineral tax revenues ($97 million) from the No Action Alternative.	Same as Alternative 3: Decrease in potential average annual employment (121), total earnings ($51 million), and mineral tax revenues ($97 million) from the No Action Alternative.

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Proposed JMH CAP
Special Management Area and Other Management Area Management Impacts analyzed under Recreation Management.	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative	Same as No Action Alternative: Impacts analyzed under Recreation Management.